BAP
R591c
COPY 1

145
3
H85

Library of the Theological Seminary,
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No. 1

SCB
10293
c.1

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

http://www.archive.org/details/christianbaptism00ripl

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM:

AN

EXAMINATION

OF

PROFESSOR STUART'S ESSAY

IN THE BIBLICAL REPOSITORY, APRIL, 1833,

ON

"THE MODE OF BAPTISM."

BY HENRY J. RIPLEY,
Professor of Biblical Literature in the Newton Theological Institution.

BOSTON:
LINCOLN, EDMANDS & CO.
1833.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1833,
By Lincoln, Edmands & Co.
in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Massachusetts.

BOSTON:
Samuel N. Dickinson, Printer,
52, Washington Street.

PREFACE.

The performance, which is examined in the following pages, is an article which was published in the Biblical Repository at Andover. It may very naturally be asked, why the Examination was not given to the public through the same medium, so that the same class of readers might have each performance. In reply to such an inquiry, I have to say, that I sought for a place in the Repository, but my application was unsuccessful.

The following note and the reply to it, will furnish a full view of this matter.

Newton, July 24, 1833.

To the Editor of the Biblical Repository:

Dear Sir,

There is an article by me in a state of forwardness, intended to occupy a place in the number of the Biblical Repository for October, 1833. It is an Examination of Professor Stuart's article on the Mode of Christian Baptism, which appeared in the April number of the work. It would probably require between forty and sixty pages, perhaps more. As intended for the Repository, its spirit and language will not, I trust, be unworthy of your publication.

As the original article was admitted into the Repository, without any qualifying appendage, may I not cherish a strong confidence that justice and candor will lead to the admission of the proposed article; and that it will appear in your work unincumbered, and left to make its own impression?

Please favor me with an early reply, informing me whether you will thus admit the article into the October number, and at what time it must be placed in your hands.

With sincere respect and with earnest desires that you may be sustained and blessed in your valuable labors,

I am yours,

H. J. Ripley.

Theol. Sem. Andover, July 27, 1833.

Rev. and Dear Sir,

In reply to your note of the 24th inst. I would inform you that the manuscript for the October number of the Biblical Repository is already prepared. The printing was commenced a week since, and is expected to be completed by the beginning of September, excepting, perhaps, the indexes. An allusion to these facts you will see in a note subjoined to the table of contents in the July number just issued.

As to the general point of admitting articles, you would hardly, in any case, expect from me a decisive answer, either affirmatively or negatively, before the manuscript should have been submitted to my examination. In the present instance, I cannot doubt that the spirit and language of the essay would be such, as to render it a valuable acquisition to the Repository. Permit me, however, to observe, that the plan of the Repository does not include controversy. If it be asked, Why then was an article like that of Prof. Stuart admitted? the answer is easy. The Theological Seminary in this place, as well as that at Newton, with which you are connected, was established expressly to support certain principles, and to counteract certain others; and these are known to the world. The Biblical Repository, as published here by individuals connected with the Seminary—although itself in no sense the organ of that

Institution—would yet naturally be expected to maintain the same principles; indeed, there would be an incongruity, were it to adopt articles intended directly to impugn those principles. If, therefore, Prof. Stuart, or any other gentleman, in the course of his official duties, chooses to survey the field of one of the great ecclesiastical controversies, and give the results of his examination in the form of dispassionate and scientific discussion, there would seem to be nothing inappropriate in making the Repository the medium of communicating his views to the public. If in doing this, the writer has committed mistakes which require to be publicly corrected, it would of course be right and proper that these should be pointed out in the same work. But it does seem to me a matter of question, whether the most liberal candor, or love of justice, could require the admission of a formal examination and reply, which, from its very nature, must be in a measure polemic and personal. It is easy to test this question by a *vice versa* view of the case. Were a similar journal connected with your Seminary at Newton, the public would of right expect from it a calm and scientific support of the distinguishing principles of your church; but had such an article appeared in it, and the essay of Prof. Stuart been offered in reply, would candor or justice have required its admission?

Although, therefore, I cannot but express my hearty good will towards a full and free discussion, on your part, of the subject of Baptism; yet you will perceive that I have doubts on the general question as to the propriety of its appearing in the Repository. Still, if under the circumstances you see fit to favour me with the perusal of your manuscript, I will act in the case according to my best judgment, and as I shall feel to be most in accordance with the great interests which we both are labouring to promote.

I need hardly say how much gratification it would afford me, if you, and the other gentlemen at Newton would occasionally give me the aid of your labours in behalf of the Repository. There are very many topics of deep and common interest, where neither our views nor our feelings can be otherwise than

in unison. To me it would ever be matter of delight, to aid in making *these* prominent, both among ourselves and throughout our respective churches.

With great and sincere respect,
I am, dear sir, yours, &c.
Edward Robinson.

Rev. Prof. Ripley,
Theol. Sem. Newton.

The hope of obtaining a place in the Repository was abandoned; and at my request, permission was afterwards given to make public the preceding correspondence, if I should deem it proper.

I then concluded to alter my plan, by adapting my little work to others besides learned readers, and by making it so far complete in itself, that it might be fully understood without recurring to the original article. This circumstance, together with the pressure of my official duties, will account for its not appearing so soon as it may have been expected.

I have felt the delicacy of my undertaking. My aversion to appear before the public as a writer, particularly on a controverted subject, was much increased by the relation which I formerly sustained to the author, whose work I was to examine. At the same time yielding to the call which was made for my services, I was encouraged by the thought that I should be less

exposed to the danger of cherishing unhallowed feeling, and of employing unkind language, than if the writer had no special claims upon my regard; while, on the other hand, a sense of my accountableness to our common Master, and a conviction of truth, would, I hoped, lead me to employ language not destitute of gravity and force. I trust, I have not erred in stating my convictions too strongly, nor in pointing out too forcibly what I deem the erroneous representations of Professor Stuart. I have endeavored to avoid all appearance of arrogant assumption, on the one hand; I have also labored, on the other, to avoid every feeling of unworthy submissiveness.

Should any of my readers think it impossible, that a man of Professor Stuart's erudition should have justly laid himself open to so many corrections, as the following pages exhibit, I have only to request, that they look not at any man's assertion of opinions, but at the arguments produced. And here, lest I should seem to undervalue the labors in general, of one who eminently deserves well of the Christian public, I would make a respectful and grateful mention of the helps for fundamental instruction with which he has favored theological students; of his several valuable essays; and of his Com-

mentaries on the Epistles to the Hebrews and to the Romans. Works of such general excellence cannot fail to secure for their author the esteem of a discerning community. I have indeed, in the following pages, fully expressed my dissent from the views which he has advanced, in his Commentary, on Romans 6 : 3, 4. But his remarks on these verses do not exhibit his usual strength. That he should fall into errors when writing on baptism, is not surprising. It not unfrequently happens, that men of distinguished ability seem, when contending against the obviously scriptural view of this subject, to be shorn of their strength.

Many persons are unwilling to listen to a discussion concerning baptism. Besides other reasons, they profess to consider it a dispute about a mere mode or form. I do not regard it in this light. If I did, I should think my time and labor very poorly bestowed. The controversy respecting baptism, in all its parts, is more important than many imagine. The alterations which men have made in respect to this ordinance, have had a very unhappy influence on the cause of Christ. It is, therefore, a worthy service, to attempt the removal of these alterations and the restoring of its primitive simplicity to one of the institutes of our Lord. The

union of real Christians in feeling and action is deeply involved in right views of this subject. Roman Catholic errors could be more successfully combatted, if the unscriptural practices in respect to baptism, which prevail in many Protestant communities, should be abandoned. For it is well known, that Papists have parried the force of arguments which Protestants have brought against their errors, by inquiring, What authority have you for infant baptism? When I see the attachment of many to infant baptism, and the kind of defence by which they support it, I am not at all surprised at the pertinacious adherence of Roman Catholics to practices which depend on the authority of the church. The renouncing of unscriptural practices, and the maintaining of only those practices which the Scripture sanctions respecting baptism, on the part of those who are engaged in Christian missions, would also prevent future generations of the now unevangelized parts of the earth from being afflicted with those numerous and often unkind controversies which have flowed, either directly or indirectly, from errors on this subject.

The following fact is enough to show that the heathen nations, which are now visited by Christian missionaries, are exposed to the evils

which have resulted from errors respecting baptism; and that the light, which controversy has elicited on this subject, may for a long time be withheld from the nations that shall become acquainted with the gospel. At the American Mission press, in Bombay, there was reprinted in 1832, with notes and an appendix, "A Sermon on the Baptizing of Infants," by Stephen Marshall, B. D. of the Westminster Assembly of Divines; preached nearly two hundred years ago, "in the Abbey-Church at Westminster, at the morning lecture appointed by the Honorable House of Commons." And in the Oriental Christian Spectator, a periodical issued from the same press, there is a controversy on this part of Christian duty.

Let Christians recede from what the Bible does not authorize, and the happy results, above named, might be hoped for. In this day of Christian enterprise, when the servants of Christ are carrying the gospel to all nations, how mournful is the reflection, that together with the gospel, many are carrying and are sowing the seeds of future discord. Christ indeed is preached, clearly for the most part, and successfully; and therein we must all heartily rejoice. But how much better were it, if that joy were unmingled. The instructers of young ministers

and of missionaries ought to bear this in mind; and they ought to beware, lest they encourage the spread, among heathen nations, of practices which have not the Saviour's sanction; but which, like certain other ancient traditions, make void the word of God.

H. J. R.

Newton, (Mass.) Dec. 10, 1833.

CONTENTS.

SECTION FIRST.

Classical Usage of βαπτίζω [*baptizo*] 13

SECTION SECOND.

Septuagint and Apocryphal Usage 21

SECTION THIRD.

New Testament Usage, when not applied to the Rite of Baptism 38

SECTION FOURTH.

Does βαπτίζω [*baptizo*] imply that the Rite was by Immersion?

§1. General usage of the word in the New Testament, as applied to this Rite 55

§2. Circumstances attending Baptism 62

§3. Jewish Proselyte-Baptism 105

§4. Baptism in the early Christian Churches 110

§5. Is the Mode essential to the Rite? 114

SECTION FIFTH.

MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS.

Pharisaic Righteousness 135

Language not sufficiently guarded 136

Tendency of Leading Principles 138

Influence on the Philological Study of the Bible 138

Importance of this Examination.—Infant Baptism 141

Acts 19 : 1—6 144

The Letter from "An Invisible Hand."—Restricted Communion 147

EXAMINATION.

The article on the Mode of Baptism, in the Biblical Repository for April 1833, is in its author's usual style of research and apparent confidence in the strength of his positions. It is an interesting document, and is worthy of very serious attention. With sincere respect for its author, as one of my theological instructers, and a benefactor to all who love sacred learning, I purpose to present a condensed view of the article, and to examine its leading parts.

In the subsequent pages, the same order of topics will be preserved, which is followed in the article under examination, and much of its language will also be retained.

SECTION FIRST.

"*Form and Classical use of the word βαπτίζω,*" [*baptizo*].

"The original etymological root of *βαπτίζω* [baptizo], *βάπτω* [bapto], as also of the nouns and adjectives" kindred with them, "appears plainly to be the monosyllable *BAΠ*"* [Bap].——"The leading and original meaning of" this monosyllable "seems to have been *dipping*, *plunging*, *immerging*, *soaking*, or *drenching*, in some liquid

* P. 288.

substance. As kindred to this meaning, and closely united with it, the idea of *dyeing*, *coloring*, *tinging*, seems also to have been often associated with the original root, and to have passed into many of its derivates."*——"The two ideas of *immersion* and of *dyeing* or *coloring* lie at the basis of the words derived from *BAΠ* [bap], in most of their forms; although, in a few cases, *usage* has confined some particular words among these derivates solely to one class of meanings; for example, *βαφεύς*, *a dyer*, *βαφεῖον*, *a dyer's shop*, *βάπτισις*, *immersion*, *submersion*, *washing*, &c." †

The precise difference between the words *βάπτω* [bapto] and *βαπτίζω* [baptizo] is, that "while they both agree in one common and original meaning, namely, that of *immersion* or *plunging*,"‡ usage has employed *βάπτω* [bapto] to express the idea of *dyeing*, *coloring*, as well as the idea of *dipping* or *plunging;* while *βαπτίζω* [baptizo] is not employed in the additional signification of *dyeing* or *coloring*.§

It has sometimes been said, that *βαπτίζω* differs from *βάπτω*, in being a *frequentative* form of the latter, that is, in denoting repetition of the action which it indicates; on the other hand, it would seem to have been once a "common criticism" that *βαπτίζω* has a *diminutive* sense. Both of these opinions are justly regarded by the author of the article now under consideration as untenable.‖

The two words *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω* are examined, as they are so intimately related in meaning. I proceed to mention the several meanings which Prof. Stuart ascribes to these two words, as used by ancient classical authors.

"*What are the classical meanings of βάπτω and βαπτίζω?*"

---

* P. 291. † P. 292. ‡ P. 292. § Pp. 292, 293. ‖ Pp. 294—297.

1. Both of these words "mean *to dip, plunge*, or *immerge* into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." *

This meaning is sustained by references to Homer, Pindar, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Heraclides Ponticus, Herodotus, Aratus, Xenophon, Plutarch, Lucian, Diodorus Siculus, Plato, Epictetus, Hippocrates, Strabo, Polybius, Josephus. From the numerous quotations furnished in the article, I present the following as specimens.

"Homer, Od. I. 392, *As when a smith* DIPS OR PLUNGES (*βάπτει*) *a hatchet or huge pole-ax into cold water*, viz. to harden them."

"Pindar, Pyth. II. 139, describes the impotent malice of his enemies, by representing himself to be like the cork upon a net in the sea, which does not sink: *As when a net is cast into the sea, the cork swims above, so am I* UNPLUNGED (*ἀβάπτιστος*); on which the Greek scholiast, in commenting, says: "As the cork *οὐ δύνει, does not sink*, so I am *ἀβάπτιστος, unplunged, not immersed*. . . . The cork remains *ἀβάπτιστος*, and swims on the surface of the sea, being of a nature which is *ἀβάπτιστος*; in like manner I am *ἀβάπτιστος*." In the beginning of this explanation, the scholiast says: "Like the cork of a net in the sea, *οὐ βαπτίζομαι, I am not plunged* or *sunk*." The frequent repetition of the same words and sentiment, in this scholion, shows, in all probability, that it is compiled from different annotators upon the text. But the sense of *βαπτίζω* in all, is too clear to admit of any doubt."

"Herodotus, in Euterpe, speaking of an Egyptian who happens to touch a swine, says: *Going to the river* [Nile], *he* DIPS *himself* (*ἔβαψε ἑωϋτόν*) *with his clothes*."

---

* P. 298.

"Plutarch, Parall. Graec. Rom. p. 545, speaking of the stratagem of a Roman general in order to secure victory, says: *He set up a trophy, on which* DIPPING *his hand into blood* (εἰς τὸ αἷμα . . . βαπτίσας), *he wrote this inscription*, etc. In Vol. VI. p. 633 (edit. Reiske), PLUNGE (βάπτισον) *yourself into the sea.* Vol. X. p. 118, *Then* PLUNGING (βαπτίζων) *himself into the lake Copais.*"

"Diodorus Siculus, edit. Heyne IV. p. 118, *Whose ship being* SUNK OR MERGED (βαπτισθείσης). Some other editions read βυθισθείσης, *plunged into the deep*, which is a good gloss."*

"2. The verb βάπτω means *to plunge* or *thrust* into any thing that is solid, but permeable; *to plunge in* so as to cover or enclose the thing plunged."†

This meaning is sustained by references to Lycophron, Philippus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Euripides. One example may serve as a specimen. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Ant. Rom. V. 15. says; *The one* THRUST (βάψας) *his spear between the other's ribs, who at the same instant* [thrust his] *into his belly.*"‡

"3. The verb βάπτω only is employed, in order to convey the meaning, *to dip out, to dip up*, by plunging a vessel into a liquid and drawing it up."§

References are here made to Euripides, Theocritus, Hermolaus, Lycophron, Aristotle, Callimachus, Nicander.

"4. The verb βάπτω only, (and its derivatives in point of form,) signifies *to tinge, dye*, or *color.*"‖ As in Homer, Aristophanes, Aristotle, Lucian, Herodotus, Plutarch, Diodorus Siculus, Marcus Antoninus, Plato, Helladius, Josephus.

"Aristophanes, Plut. Act. II. Sc. 5, *Do not adorn yourself with garments of variegated appearance*, COLORED

---

* Pp. 298—300. † P. 300. ‡ P. 301. § P. 301. ‖ P. 301.

(*βαπτῶν* adj.) *at a great expense.*——In Aves, p. 526, the poet speaks of *ὄρνις βαπτός*, *a* COLORED *bird.* In Acharn. Act. I. Sc. I, he makes one of his bullies say: *Lest I* TINGE *you with a Sardinian hue*, *σὲ βάψω βάμμα Σαρδινιακόν*, i. e. beat you until you are all besmeared with blood; in other words, until you become of a red color."*

"5. The word *βαπτίζω* means *to overwhelm*, literally and figuratively in a variety of ways."† As in Aristotle, Evenus, Heliodorus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Plato, Lucian, Josephus, Philo Judaeus, Diodorus Siculus, Justin Martyr, Plutarch, Chrysostom.

"Aristotle, de Mirabil. Ausc. speaks of a saying among the Phenicians, that there were certain places beyond the pillars of Hercules, *which when it is ebb-tide, are not* OVERFLOWED (*μὴ βαπτίζεσθαι*), *but at full-tide are overflowed* (*κατακλύζεσθαι*); which word is here used, as an equivalent for *βαπτίζεσθαι*."

"Plato, Conviv. p. 176, *I myself am one of those who were* DRENCHED OR OVERWHELMED (*βεβαπτισμένων*) *yesterday*, viz. with wine. In another place: *Having* OVERWHELMED (*βαπτίσασα*) *Alexander with much wine.*"

"Diodorus Siculus, Tom. I. p. 107, *Most of the land animals that are intercepted by the river* [Nile], *perish, being* OVERWHELMED (*βαπτίζομενα*); here used in the literal sense. Tom. VII. p. 191, *The river, borne along by a more violent current,* OVERWHELMED (*ἐβάπτιζε*) many; the literal signification. Tom. I. p. 129, *And because they* [the nobles] *have a supply by these means* [presents], *they do not* OVERWHELM *their subjects with taxes.* Figurative."‡

"6. *Βάπτω* is also employed in the sense *to smear, to bathe*, by the application of liquid to the surface, etc."§

---

*P. 302. † P. 303. ‡ Pp. 303, 304. § P. 305.

References are here made to Sophocles, Æschylus, and Aristophanes. The mention of liquid being applied to the surface, which might seem to be a shade of difference from the preceding significations, is sufficiently explained by the examples adduced.

"Sophocles, Ajax v. 95, ἔβαψας εὖ, *thou hast well* BATHED OR SMEARED *thy sword with the Grecian army*, viz. by plunging it into the Grecian soldiers."

"Æschylus, Prometh. v. 861, *For the wife has deprived each husband of life,* BATHING (*βάψασα*) *the sword by slaughter;* where *bathing the sword* means, to make it reek with blood, by plunging it into human bodies."

In the third example, Aristophanes represents "an old comic player of Athens" as "SMEARING *himself* (*βαπτόμενος*) *with frog-colored* paints;" * a poetic expression, doubtless, indicating profuseness, and to the reader who enters into the spirit of the writer, presenting the old comic player as thoroughly besmeared as if he had dipped himself into the coloring liquid.

As illustrating this sixth signification, there is an extract from Dionysius of Halicarnassus,† in which occurs a participle not of the word *βάπτω*, but of *βαπτίζω*. As it is not easy to abbreviate it, I will quote it verbatim. "Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Vit. Homeri, p. 297, cited by Gale, p. 123, comments on the expression of Homer in Il. XVI. 333, where the poet represents Ajax as killing Cleobulus, and says: *He struck him across the neck, with his heavy sword, and the whole sword became warm with blood.* Upon this Dionysius remarks: That *the sword was so bathed* (*βαπτισθέντος*) *with blood that it became heated by it.* This is capable of being rendered, *so dipped in blood;* and so Gale renders it, p. 123. But

* P. 305. † P. 305.

if this shade of meaning was designed to be conveyed by Dionysius, would he not have written: *βαπτισθέντος οὕτως εἰς τὸ αἷμα τοῦ ξίφους κ. τ. λ.*? However I do not consider the example as altogether certain, but adduce it as a probable one."

The passage seems to me attended with no difficulty. To a reader who is acquainted with Greek, I cannot perform a more acceptable service than by transcribing the whole sentence of Dionysius, as quoted by Gale. He is commenting on Homer, Il. XVI. 333,

Πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι. . . . . .

And the whole sword was warmed with blood.

He thus writes; *Πᾶν δ' ὑπεθερμάνθη ξίφος αἵματι. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ παρέχει μείζονα ἔμφασιν, ὡς βαπτισθέντος οὕτω τοῦ ξίφους, ὥς τε θερμανθῆναι.* That is; "In this expression he exhibits very great emphasis, as much as to say, the sword was so dipped, as even to become heated." Is the least violence, I ask, done to this passage by considering *εἰς τὸ αἷμα* as understood after *οὕτω*? I need scarcely hint, how often writers omit what the mind of the reader will naturally and almost necessarily supply. Homer had used a very strong expression; his critical commentator, animated with the spirit of the author and participating in his feelings, uses another strong expression in order to make Homer's thought perfectly obvious. Let us sympathise with these two writers; let us place ourselves in the situation of a susceptible and feeling mind, endeavoring to exhibit and to illustrate the force of the poet's expression; and we cannot consider it as inappropriate to say, respecting the sword which had become heated by the blood of a slaughtered foe, that the sword was so dipped it became heated. And should the reader stop to think, *dipped into what?* how instantaneous and irresistible the reply, *into the blood*,

εἰς τὸ αἷμα. The absence of these words does not materially affect the sentence; and the meaning, *dipped*, is not forced, nor inappropriate. Perhaps a more suitable meaning, however, would be that which is furnished under the preceding number; namely, *overwhelmed*, or *overflowed*. The sentence would then stand thus; "*the sword was so overflowed* [with blood], *as even to become heated.*

The probability that βαπτισθέντος here shows that βαπτίζω [baptizo] means "*to smear, to bathe*, by the application of liquid to the surface, etc.," is very small. Does such a meaning, ascribed to βαπτίζω, cast light on Homer's language? Or was not that word employed by the commentator, because in its natural and ordinary signification it would suggest to the mind a profusion of blood by which the murderous weapon was so enveloped, that it actually became warm to the hand which was wielding it?

"7. A shade of meaning kindred to the above, viz. *to wash*, i. e. to cleanse by the use of water, is sometimes attached to the word βάπτω, in the classics."

"Aristophanes, in Eccles. *First they* WASH (βάπτουσι) *the wool in warm water, according to the old custom.* The lexicographers Suidas and Phavorinus, interpret the word βάπτουσι here by πλύνουσι, *they wash*, or *wash out;* and Stephens says (ad voc. πλύνω), that βάπτω [bapto] is peculiarly spoken of garments, as λούω is of the body, and νίπτω of the hands and feet."* Of course then the radical idea of βάπτω is retained when it signifies *to wash;* and when thus employed, it signifies a washing with which dipping was connected.

Such are the classical meanings of βάπτω [bapto] and

* P. 305.

βαπτίζω [baptizo], as furnished and arranged by Prof. Stuart. Every one can see how conformable these meanings are to the radical idea of *plunging*, *dipping*, *soaking*. The signification *to dye*, *to color*, *to tinge* (ascribed to βάπτω), may to some appear a departure from this radical idea; but it arises unquestionably from that radical idea, inasmuch as articles to be colored are dipped into the coloring matter. And after the word came to be used in this signification, it was very natural that it should be employed to express *coloring* performed in any manner, especially if it was an extensive coloring.

It is also worthy to be remarked, that of all these seven meanings only two are illustrated by passages containing the word βαπτίζω [baptizo], namely, numbers 1 and 5. To this remark, number 6 furnishes an apparent exception, one of whose illustrations contains the word; yet the word in this illustration is not only acknowledged to be "capable of being rendered *dipped*," but without doubt it means as much as *a copious covering*.

Confining our view then to βαπτίζω, the following are its only meanings as used by classical writers;

1. *To dip*, *plunge*, or *immerge* into any thing liquid.
2. *To overwhelm*, literally and figuratively.

SECTION SECOND.

"*Use of βάπτω and βαπτίζω in the Septuagint and the Apocrypha.*"

"1. The verb βάπτω signifies *to plunge*, *immerse*, *dip in.*"

"Lev. 11 : 32, Every vessel [that is unclean], *shall be* PLUNGED (βαφήσεται) *into water;* Heb. הִוָּבֵא, shall be

brought or introduced. 4: 6. *And the priest shall* DIP (*βάψει*) his finger into the blood; Heb. טָבַל.

"Joshua 3: 15. *The feet of the priests . . . were* DIPPED (*ἐβάφησαν*) into a part of the water of the Jordan; Heb. טָבַל.

"Ruth 2: 14, *And thou shalt* DIP (*βάψεις*) *thy morsel in vinegar*, (*ἐν τῷ ὄξει*, בַּחֹמֶץ); Heb. verb טָבַל."

"In like manner *βαπτίζω* [baptizo] takes the same signification. 2 K. 5: 14, And Naaman went down, and PLUNGED HIMSELF (*ἐβαπτίσατο*) seven times into the river Jordan; Heb. טָבַל. The prophet Elisha had said: *λοῦσαι ἑπτάκις ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ*, WASH THYSELF *seven times in the Jordan*, 2 K. 5: 10."* This direction of the prophet, Naaman complied with by repairing to the Jordan and dipping himself in it seven times.

"2. *To smear over*, or *moisten* by dipping in; in which sense I find *βάπτω* only employed."

To sustain this meaning, the following passages are referred to. "Lev. 4: 17. *And the priest shall* SMEAR OVER OR MOISTEN (*βάψει*) *his finger*, *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος*, *by*, or *with the blood of the bullock;* Heb. וְטָבַל ··· מִן הַדָּם.

"Lev. 14: 16, *And he* [the priest] *shall* SMEAR OVER (*βάψει*) *his right finger with the oil*, *ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλαίου*; Heb. וְטָבַל מִן הַשֶּׁמֶן.

"Ex. 12: 22, *And* MOISTENING OR SMEARING *it* [the bundle of hyssop] *with the blood* (*βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος*)." †

In these several cases, there was doubtless a *dipping* into the blood, and into the oil, even if the idea of smearing was intended to be expressed. But the signification here ascribed to *βάπτω*, namely, *to smear over*, is not satisfactorily sustained by the examples adduced.

---

* Pp. 306, 307. † P. 307.

The proper radical meaning, *to dip*, may here be retained. The Septuagint, in the first two passages, gives a literal rendering of the Hebrew expression; and the Hebrew preposition מִן, for which the Greek ἀπὸ is here used, is often employed to express a partitive meaning; that is, it shows that a part of whatever is named was employed. This meaning is rightly expressed in our English version of Lev. 4 : 17, *And the priest shall dip his finger* in some *of the blood.*

That the preposition מִן is thus employed, needs not be largely proved. Gesenius, in his Hebrew Lexicon, observes, "Before מִן, we must often supply the word *some;* Lev. 5 : 9. מִדָּם *some of the blood.* Ex. 17 : 5, מִזִּקְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל *some of the elders of Israel.*"

Michaelis, in his edition of the Hebrew Bible, has this remark on the words מִן הַדָּם in Lev. 4 : 17; "Into *a part* of the blood; literally, *some of* the blood. מִן is often thus used."*

Augusti and De Wette in their German translation of the Bible, a translation deservedly held in high estimation, though they have not given a literal version of the passages appealed to by Prof. Stuart, yet felt in no wise "constrained" to depart from the radical meaning of the verb. Thus, Lev. 4 : 17 they render, *And the priest shall* DIP *his finger into the blood;* and 14 : 16, *And the priest shall* DIP *his right finger into the oil.*†

It deserves also to be mentioned that the very same act, which is expressed in Lev. 4 : 17 by the words וְטָבַל··· מִן הַדָּם, is, in verse 6th, expressed by the words

* In *partem* sanguinis. l. *aliquid de* sanguine. Sic מִן saepe ponitur.

† Lev. 4 : 17, Und der Priester soll seine Finger in das Blut tauchen. 14 : 16, Und der Priester soll seinen rechten Finger in das Oel tauchen.

וְטָבַל ... בַּדָּם; that is, in English, vs. 17, *And he shall* DIP ... into some *of the blood*, is expressed in vs. 6, thus; *And he shall dip ... into the blood.* The only difference in the two cases is, the 17th verse expresses more specifically *(into some*, or *into a part, of the blood)*, what the 6th verse expresses less specifically *(into the blood).*

Let us now apply this principle to the two passages adduced. Lev. 4 : 17 will then read, as in our English version, *And the priest shall dip his finger* in [into] some, or a part, *of the blood:* 14 : 16 will read thus, *And the priest shall dip his right finger* into the part *of the oil that is in his left hand.* Thus this principle in the Hebrew language respecting טָבַל, so repeatedly developing itself, is in this manner strictly regarded, and the verb retains its proper radical meaning.

Guided by this examination of Hebrew use, we at once see in what manner to render the Greek of the Septuagint. For the Septuagint is, in these verses, literally conformed to the Hebrew; it presents, so to speak, only a Hebrew expression in Greek words. The Septuagint then is here to be translated not by Greek rules, but by Hebrew rules. Indeed, if we should attempt to translate the Greek version of these passages according to the principles of the Greek language, I apprehend, we should find difficulties almost, if not quite, inexplicable; I apprehend we should search in vain for authorities that would warrant the employing of the English word *by* or *with*, as equivalent to the Greek ἀπὸ, when connected with an active verb like βάπτω.

The preceding remarks remove all difficulty from the third passage, Ex. 12 : 22, which Prof. Stuart thus renders; "*And* MOISTENING OR SMEARING *it* [the bundle of hyssop] *with the blood* (βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος)." The Hebrew has in this passage, וּטְבַלְתֶּם בַּדָּם; and the Sep-

tuagint, if it had correctly and literally rendered this passage, would have employed, not *βάψαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος*, but *βάψαντες εἰς τὸ αἷμα*, DIPPING *it into the blood.* Taking the Septuagint, however, just as it now stands, how shall its language here be rendered? It is very possible, that the Hebrew manuscript which the Greek translators employed, varied from our present reading, and instead of בְּדָם had מִדָּם; which would of course account for their manner of rendering, and would require us to explain their language in the manner that has already been exhibited. Without resorting to any mere possibility, however, let it be considered, that this expression in Exodus is one that occurs frequently in the Septuagint; it ought then to be compared with the same expression in other places. Now the other places, in which it occurs, lead us at once to that frequent Hebrew use of מִן by which the idea of a partitive is expressed. We must then explain this passage in the Septuagint, in the same manner as we explain kindred passages. On these principles we should be constrained to render this passage in Exodus as translated in the Septuagint, in the following manner; *And dipping it* into some, or into a part, *of the blood;* the Greek *ἀπὸ* expressing what in Hebrew is expressed by מִן, that is, the idea of a partitive.

The result, then, of my remarks on these verses is, that the meaning *to smear over*, even though performed by dipping in, is not well supported, and consequently ought not to be retained.

But to proceed to the other alleged meanings of the two verbs.

"3. *To overwhelm;* where *βαπτίζω* is used."

There is only one example of this use; and in this the word is employed figuratively.

"Is. 21 : 4. *My iniquity* OVERWHELMS *me* (*με βαπτίζει*); where the Hebrew has בִּעָתָה, to terrify, etc." *

"4. Of the sense of *tinging* or *coloring*, given to *βάπτω*," there is only one example, and this a doubtful one, as "the reading is various and contested." † It is Ezek. 23 : 15. Some editions of the Septuagint read *τιάραι βαπταὶ*, *dyed*, or *colored turbans;* while the Roman edition reads *παράβαπτα*, *tinctured*, *colored*, *variegated with colors.*

"5. *To wash, cleanse by water;* where *βαπτίζω* is used." ‡ To sustain this meaning, two passages are adduced from the Apocrypha. "Thus it is said of Judith, in c. 12 : 7, that she went out by night, into the valley of Bethulia, and WASHED HERSELF (*ἐβαπτίζετο*) in the camp, at the fountain of water."

"In Sirach, 31 : 25, we find the expression *βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ*, *he who is* CLEANSED *from a dead* [carcase] *and toucheth it again, what does he profit by his washing* (*τῷ λουτρῷ αὐτοῦ*)? The phrase *βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ* may be easily explained, by comparing such passages as are to be found in Lev. 11 : 25. 28. 31. 39, 40. Num. 19 : 18, etc. by which it appears, that a person who had touched a dead body was ceremonially defiled, and must wash his clothes and his person in order to become clean."

Of these passages, I observe, it is by no means clear that the radical meaning of *βαπτίζω* [baptizo] ought to be left out of sight, so that the word should be translated by the general term *wash*, or *cleanse*, without any allusion to the specific kind, or extent, of the washing. Are there any circumstances which entirely forbid us to believe that a bathing of the whole person is here intend-

* P. 307. † P. 307. ‡ P. 308.

ed? If the circumstances of the two cases clearly show without doubt, that an entire bathing was not performed, or could not be performed, then we must assume a modified meaning of the word. But if there be no necessity for departing from the radical and ordinary meaning, then we are not at liberty to put another construction upon the word.

Let us examine the passages. The first is Judith, c. 12 : 7; thus expressed in our English version, "She ... went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia and washed herself in a fountain of water by the camp." Instead of *in a fountain of water*, a more correct translation would be *at the fountain of water*. What hinders us now from believing that there was an entire immersion, or bathing of her whole person? Prof. Stuart observes, "The example of Judith shows very clearly, that *washing* of the person may be designated by βαπτίζω; for into the fountain in the midst of the camp, it is not probable that she *plunged*."* Perhaps not; but though she did not *plunge*, she might yet have *immersed* herself. Is *plunging* the only mode in which an immersion can be performed? Besides, the verse correctly rendered, and rendered too by Prof. Stuart a few lines preceding this sentence, does not assert that the action, whatever it was, was performed *in the fountain*, but *at the fountain*, (ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς). There surely may have been conveniencies for bathing the whole person "at the fountain," in the immediate vicinity of it, and conveniencies which were supplied with water from the fountain. If such accommodations were not provided for the use of the army, yet it should be remembered that there were in the immediate vicinity of Bethulia, where the army was encamped, several

* P. 308.

fountains belonging to the city; and that the one here spoken of, was a peculiarly important one, from which "all the inhabitants of Bethulia" obtained their water; (c. 7 : 7. 12 comp. with 13 : 10). Is it unlikely that a Jewish city, thus furnished with natural supplies of water, would also be furnished at the fountain, or fountains, with artificial accommodations for bathing? Granting, however, the probability of this, it may be asked, is it probable that a female, a Jewish female, would bathe, or immerse herself, "in the midst of the camp"—a camp, too, belonging to an army of heathens? Perhaps not. But then it is nowhere, in the book of Judith, intimated that the action was performed "in the midst of the camp." All parts of a camp are not equally exposed; and the place to which she resorted seems to have been chosen, because, among other reasons, it was somewhat retired. She went to that place habitually for special prayer and purification; and the bathing or immersion, was a religious service (11 : 17. 12 : 9. 12 : 7. 13 : 10). The place, though within the precincts of the camp, yet might have been far from the midst of it; this c. 13 : 10, 11, seems clearly to intimate. Besides, this religious ceremony was performed in the night; and she was doubtless accompanied by the maid servant whom she took with her on her adventurous expedition (10 : 5. 10). She is represented as remarkable for her piety and her confidence in the divine protection; and besides, Holofernes, the general of the army, had taken her under his special protection, and had given express orders that no one should interfere with her movements, (12 : 6, 7).

There is nothing, then, in the circumstances of this case which forbids us to believe that Judith did actually immerse, or bathe, her whole person. The ceremony

could be performed with perfect safety, and without any sacrifice of delicacy. If the writer intended to convey the thought that she did thus immerse herself, the language he has employed was adapted to convey that thought. It is certainly, then, the dictate of propriety to assign to the word, in this place, its ordinary meaning, rather than by the unfounded apprehension of impossibility or indelicacy, to determine that it cannot have that meaning.*

And why, if it were necessary, may she not have entered into the water covered with a suitable garment? Maimonides, as quoted by Lightfoot on Matt. 3 : 6, observes, "If any should enter into the water with their clothes on, yet their washing holds good; because the water would pass through their clothes, and their garments would not hinder it."

I proceed to the second passage produced to sustain the meaning, *to wash, to cleanse by water*, ascribed to βαπτίζω [baptizo] in the Apocrypha. It is Sirach 31 : 25 [English version, Ecclesiasticus 34 : 25], thus translated in the common version, "*He that washeth himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washing.*" In the article under consideration, it is thus rendered; *He who is* CLEANSED

* That Judith did actually bathe herself in the water, was the opinion of Spencer, as expressed in his elaborate work on the Ritual Laws of the Hebrews. He says: "That the Jews also [i. e. as well as the Gentiles] when about to perform their vows, sometimes cleansed the whole body in a bath, I gather from the history of *Judith* who, when she had resolved to pray, is said *to have baptized* herself *in a fountain of water*." De Leg. Heb. Rit. p. 789. Judæos etiam, vota facturos, quandoque totum corpus lavacro purgasse, ex historia *Judithæ* colligo, quæ, cum precari statuisset, *aquæ fonte* seipsam *baptizasse* dicitur.

[*βαπτιζόμενος*] *from a dead* [carcase] *and toucheth it again, what does he profit by his washing?*

We have now to inquire, whether the washing, the cleansing, here spoken of, was of such a kind as clearly to show that there was not an immersion, or a total bathing, of the person. If there be no satisfactory evidence that an entire bathing was not usually performed on the occasion mentioned in the passage, and if, on the other hand, there be only a small probability that an entire bathing was performed, we surely have not sufficient authority for diverting the word *βαπτίζω* from its customary meaning, and for refusing to it any recognition of the manner, or the extent, of the washing.

Let us see how the case stands. That *βαπτίζω*, as here employed, does not recognize any specification as to manner or extent, but that it simply means *to wash, to cleanse by water*, Prof. Stuart considers clear from the directions given in the Mosaic law, respecting those who had contracted defilement by the touch of a dead body.* These directions are found in Lev. 11 : 25. 28. 31. 39, 40. Num. 19 : 18, 19. The substance of them is, that the defiled person must wash his clothes and himself in order to become clean. The texts quoted from Leviticus speak only of the washing of the clothes ; the passage from the book of Numbers describes all the parts of the ceremony, and is therefore to be particularly considered. It stands thus in our version ; Num. 19 : 16. 18, 19. *And whosoever toucheth ... a dead body, or a bone of a man, or a grave, shall be unclean seven days. And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water and sprinkle it upon the tent and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that*

* P. 308.

were there, and upon him that touched a bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave: And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day: and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and BATHE HIMSELF IN WATER, *and shall be clean at even.*

Is our version incorrect in saying, *he shall* BATHE HIMSELF IN WATER, as the concluding part of the ceremony? No. The Hebrew word thus translated (רָחַץ) signifies *bathing*, as well as a less extensive washing. It is used in Ex. 2 : 5, where Pharaoh's daughter is said to have gone down to the river Nile to wash, that is, *to bathe*. It is also used in reference to cleansing for the leprosy; Lev. 14 : 8, 9, *And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes, and shave off all his hair, and* WASH HIMSELF IN WATER, *that he may be clean ... But it shall be on the seventh day that he shall shave all his hair off his head, and his beard and his eyebrows, even all his hair he shall shave off; and he shall wash his clothes, also he shall* WASH HIS FLESH IN WATER, *and he shall be clean.* That the word *flesh*, as here employed, is equivalent to *body*, will not, probably, be questioned. Scarcely a doubt can be entertained, in view of these verses, that the leprous man, in whose case there was to be so much particularity, did actually bathe his whole person as the concluding part of the ceremony by which purification was obtained. This same Hebrew word is also used in Lev. 15 : 5—18, in which verses such cases of uncleanness are mentioned as would lead one naturally to expect that an entire bathing should be performed. In the 13th verse of this 15th chapter, it is said, *he shall* BATHE HIS FLESH IN RUNNING WATER; and in the 16th verse, *he shall* WASH [BATHE רָחַץ] ALL HIS FLESH IN WATER. The history of Naaman, the leper, sheds light upon the meaning of this word,

when used in reference to cleansing. The prophet (2 K. 5 : 10—14) directed him, *go and* WASH [רְחַץ] *in Jordan seven times.* What did Naaman understand the prophet as enjoining in this direction? Let the 14th verse speak. *Then went he down and* DIPPED HIMSELF [וַיִּטְבֹּל] *seven times in Jordan.*

It may here be mentioned that the German translation of the Bible by Augusti and De Wette, employs the word *bathe* in Num. 19 : 19, and in all the other places mentioned above in which the same Hebrew word occurs. Thus, Ex. 2 : 5, *Then came down the daughter of Pharaoh to* BATHE *in the stream.** So of the rest.

An attentive consideration of what has now been brought forward will lead, not to a small probability, but to say the least, to the highest degree of probability, that when in Num. 19 : 19, the person defiled by the touch of a dead body is required to wash, or bathe, it was actually a bathing that was enjoined, and not a partial washing. This conclusion is in perfect accordance with the requisition that his clothes must be thoroughly washed. If his clothes were so defiled by the touch of a dead body that they must be *thoroughly* washed before they could be ceremonially clean, is it not likely that his *person* was required to be thoroughly washed? Consider, also, that according to Lev. 11 : 32, if a dead animal should fall upon "any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be, wherein any work is done, it must be PUT INTO WATER . . . so it shall be cleansed." Was it not then in perfect accordance with the Mosaic precepts, that the human person defiled by the touch of a dead body, should undergo a complete bathing?

I add, once more, that the very language of the pas-

* Um im Strome zu baden.

sage under consideration coincides with this view. The word which is rendered WASHING in this verse, is more specific in signification than our English word *washing*, and ought rather to be rendered BATHING. The verb from which this word is derived, (λούω), designates a *general washing*, or *bathing*, of the person; while to express a mere *partial washing*, as of the hands, or face, or feet, a different verb (νίπτω) is employed. The difference between these two Greek words is happily exemplified in the gospel of John, 13 : 10; a correct translation of which is, *He that has been* BATHED (λούω), *needeth not save to* WASH (νίπτω) *his feet*, which might have become soiled in walking from the bath. By bearing in mind this more specific sense of the word rendered WASHING, that is, BATHING, the correspondence between the two parts of the verse is very conspicuous; *He that has* IMMERSED HIMSELF in order to be cleansed *from* the defilement occasioned by the touch of *a dead body*, *and toucheth it again*, *what availeth his* BATHING?

And here it is suitable to mention what Lightfoot on Matt. 3 : 6, produces from Maimonides; "Wheresoever in the law, washing of the body or garments is mentioned, it means nothing else, than the washing of the whole body. For if any wash himself all over, except the very top of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness." Lightfoot, on Mark 7 : 4, produces also from another Jewish writer a sentence, which shows that pollution occasioned by the touch of the dead, was so great that the person "must plunge his whole body."

But enough. My remarks on Sirach 31 : 25 [English ver. 34 : 25], I bring to a close by saying, that even if the evidence, adduced to show the meaning of this passage, did not exist, yet the method by which Prof. Stuart would show that βαπτίζω here means simply *to cleanse by*

water, is liable to objection. For it proceeds on the principle, that the Jews in the later periods of their history paid a strict regard, in their ceremonies, to what Moses had enjoined. But is this true? Did they not adopt a multitude of traditions; and by some of their traditions did they not even transgress the commandments of God? Even if Moses had not required them, in such a case as is mentioned in Sirach, to bathe their whole persons, this would not prove, that they did not, in subsequent ages, add to his requisitions on this point, as they did on other points. We may in truth say, that even if Moses did not intend there should be a total ablution in the case adduced, the word *βαπτίζω* employed to express this ablution in subsequent times, might still retain its radical power, and might indicate what addition the later Jews made to the original law. This word, I say, might still be purposely used in its radical signification; and instead of the law of Moses modifying its meaning, it might show how the Jews modified the law. We might stand on such ground, and be sustained by the Jewish history. But in the present case, there is no need of taking this ground; for I trust, the evidence here produced is not only abundant, but is also appropriate and sufficient to show, that in the earlier periods of the Jewish history, Moses was understood as requiring those, who had become defiled by the touch of a dead body, to bathe their persons as the concluding ceremony of the purification.

I cannot then regard the statement as sufficiently sustained, that *βαπτίζω* in the Septuagint and the Apocrypha means simply *to wash, to cleanse by water*, without containing any reference to the manner, or the extent of the washing. The proofs that it has such a meaning are inadequate. The instances produced furnish no

satisfactory reason for thus abandoning the radical meaning of the word. They may be adduced to show that *βαπτίζω* has the meaning *to wash*, or *cleanse, by bathing in water*.

I have thus arrived at the last meaning alleged in this section.

"6. *To moisten, wet, bedew;* where *βάπτω* is used."

"Thus in Dan. 4 : 30 [Eng. version 4 : 33], it is said, that Nebuchadnezzar was driven from among men, and made to eat grass like the ox, and that *his body was* MOISTENED, WET (*ἐβάφη*) *with the dew of heaven.*

"Dan. 5 : 21, *His body was* MOISTENED (*ἐβάφη*) *with the dew of heaven.*"*

The Chaldee word, to which *βάπτω* corresponds in these passages, means "like the Greek *βάπτω*, both *to dip* and *to tinge* or *color*."† The Greek word then is a fair representative of the Chaldee; and any remarks to be made upon it require no special modification on account of its being a translation of an original.

Is the English word *moisten* or *wet*, or *bedew*, an adequate representative of the Greek word? The circumstances of the case may furnish a reply to this question. They show how very extensive was this moistening or wetting; and how very appropriately the word *βάπτω* is used in these places. For Nebuchadnezzar had been, for nights in succession, till *seven times* had passed over him, COVERED *with dew;* he had been, as it were, *wet all over* with it; as we say in familiar conversation, he had been *without a dry spot.* Driven from human habitations, and dwelling with the beasts of the field, till his hairs were grown like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws, thus abiding in the open air all night, exposed to

* P. 308. † P. 309.

the copious dews of an oriental climate, and destitute of clothing, what could be more natural than to speak of him as having been immersed in, or covered with, the dew of heaven? In relating so signal, so unusual an event, the word, formed from a root whose "leading and original meaning" is "*dipping*, *plunging*, *immerging*, *soaking*, or *drenching*, in some liquid substance," would readily present itself to the writer's mind; nor with the full knowledge of its proper meaning, would he have any doubt that every reader would rightly understand it. The Scriptures are not "coldly correct and critically dull;" the language of common life breathes through all their pages. And who, I ask, in relating this singular event, or narrating it with his pen, would hesitate a moment to say, the unhappy monarch was *drenched* with the dew of heaven? And what critic in commenting upon this expression, would be thought to have done justice to it, by saying, the word *drench* means *to moisten*, or *bedew*, or *wet?* To say that the word βάπτω in the passages produced from Daniel, is only equivalent *to moisten*, or *bedew*, or *wet*, seems to me an error somewhat akin to his, who should say that in this passage of Milton,

> . . . . . A cold shuddering dew
> Dips me all o'er,*

the word *dips* is adequately explained by ascribing to it the meaning *to moisten.* And though a dictionary should mention the word *moisten* or *bedew*, as one of the meanings of the verb *dip*, on account of this passage of Milton, yet who would feel that the word was properly explained, or that the passage was properly explained

* Comus.

without a reference to the primary, original meaning of the word *dip?*

I consider, then, the word βάπτω as hyperbolically used in the book of Daniel; and as naturally suggested by the circumstance, that the whole surface of Nebuchadnezzar's body was exposed to the dew, and became covered with it; so that much the same effect was produced, as if his body had been immersed in it. These passages are easily explained without ascribing to βάπτω the meaning *to moisten;* and therefore they do not require this additional item in the significations of the word.

A summary of the results to which the examination in this section conducts, may be thus expressed:

Of the six meanings ascribed, by Prof. Stuart, to βάπτω and βαπτίζω in the Septuagint and the Apocrypha, no dependence can be placed on number 4, because the example produced is a doubtful one; number 2 is incorrect, as it arises from not sufficiently regarding the Hebrew construction; number 6 is inapplicable, as it merely exhibits a hyperbolical use of the word; number 5 is defective, as no good reason can be produced to show that the washing, the cleansing, was *not* performed by a total bathing of the person, and good reasons can be produced to show, that an entire bathing *was* performed. The remaining significations, number 1, *to plunge*, *immerse*, *dip in*, and number 3, *to overwhelm*, are unquestionable.

Of these six meanings, three are illustrated by passages containing the word βαπτίζω; namely; 1, *to plunge*, *immerse*, *dip in;* 3, *to overwhelm;* 5, *to wash*, *cleanse by water.* To this fifth meaning there should have been annexed, according to the preceding examination, a notice that the washing, or cleansing, was performed by a bathing or an immersing, of the person.

The meanings, then, of *βαπτίζω* in the Septuagint and the Apocrypha, may be thus stated;

1. *To plunge, immerse, dip in.*
2. *To overwhelm.*
3. *To wash*, or *cleanse, by bathing the person in water.*

SECTION THIRD.

"*Meaning of the words βάπτω, βαπτίζω, and their derivatives in the New Testament, when not applied to the rite of Baptism.*"

Two meanings are here ascribed to *βάπτω*; 1, "*to dip;*"* as in Luke 16 : 24, *That he may* DIP (*βάψῃ*) *the tip of his finger in water;* John 13 : 26, *It is he to whom I shall give the morsel or crumb* [Eng. ver. a sop] *when I have* DIPPED *it* (*βάψας*).

If in the first of these verses, the rendering *wet* should be preferred to *dip*, because *ὕδατος* [water] is in the Genitive and may be considered "the Genitive of instrument,"* there still can be no doubt that the action mentioned was to be performed by dipping.

2. The second meaning is "*to dye;*"* as in "Rev. 19 : 13, *a garment* DYED (*βεβαμμένον*) *in blood,*" [Eng. ver. a vesture dipped in blood].

This word (*βάπτω*, bapto) is not used in the New Testament with reference to baptism; nor do any of its derivatives occur. We may pass then at once to the other word, *βαπτίζω* [baptizo].

1. The first meaning which the article under consideration ascribes to *βαπτίζω* in the New Testament, when

* P. 309.

not used with reference to the rite of Baptism, is "*to wash*, in the literal sense."*

The following passages are produced as illustrations of this meaning. "Mark 7 : 3, 4, *The Pharisees* [returning] *from the market eat not, except they* WASH THEMSELVES, *βαπτίσωνται*, Mid. voice."

"Luke 11 : 38, *But the Pharisee, seeing him, wondered that he had not first* WASHED HIMSELF (*ἐβαπτίσθη*) *before dinner.*"*

No comment is furnished on these passages in the article we are considering; and yet something more might have been justly expected, than the simple assertion, that the word here means *to wash.* I proceed to examine the passages.

Mark 7 : 3, 4. It is to be regretted that the third verse was not produced by Prof. Stuart, as well as the part of the fourth which contains the word under examination. The whole passage, as expressed in the common version, is the following: *For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they wash their hands oft, eat not, holding the tradition of the elders: And* when they come *from the market, except they wash, they eat not.* Here are mentioned two instances of washing (so called); the first, a matter of constant occurrence; the second, an observance performed after returning from the market. The inquiry is a very natural one, did these two washings differ from one another in any respect? To this inquiry, an affirmative answer can scarcely be avoided. For, in the first place, one was a washing which commonly occurred before a meal, without regard to the employment that had preceded it; so that even if a person had remained at home, still before taking his meal, he would wash his

* P. 309.

hands. The other was a ceremony, performed after having been exposed to the various occasions of defilement which would be connected with his attendance at market. Such was the variety of persons and things with which he might have come in contact, that a more formal and thorough ablution would naturally be performed.

In examining the whole passage, especially in the original, an attentive reader will perceive an advance in the thought. There is presented, at first, the *general* custom, and then a *specific* case, namely, after *returning from the market*. If in common, the hands were washed before eating, the reader is prepared to hear that, after returning from a mixed crowd of people, something different from, or additional to, this washing, was performed. An English reader might overlook this, on account of the repetition of the word WASH in the fourth verse; although I cannot but think he would, if attentive, be sensible of some deficiency in the representation, unless he should conclude from the repeated use of the same word *wash*, that his expectation of a more formal and thorough ceremony after returning from market, was an incorrect one. But to a careful reader of the Greek, no such sense of deficiency arises, and no such disappointment occurs. For, as further showing that there was a difference between the two instances of washing, I observe,

In the second place, two different Greek words are employed to express the washing in the two different cases. In the third verse we read ἐὰν μὴ νίψωνται; while in the fourth, we read ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται. These two words well correspond to the circumstances of the two cases; and rendered according to their proper meaning, clearly exhibit the advance in the thought. To make this matter plain to a mere English reader, I

observe, there is a difference between these two verses in the original, like what would be felt if they were thus translated: *For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they* WASH *their hands oft, eat not; And when they come from the market, except they* BATHE, *they eat not.*

To proceed. Since now there is a plain difference between these two cases of washing, as suggested both by the occasions and by the different verbs employed in the original, what was the precise difference between them? Was it that, on common occasions, they washed their hands only; while on the occasion of returning from the market, they immersed, or bathed, their whole persons? So thought Vatablus, a distinguished professor of Hebrew at Paris, for whom the Jews of his acquaintance, entertained a very high regard. "They bathed," he says, on Mark 7 : 4, "their whole persons."* So thought Grotius, who says on Mark 7 : 4, "They cleansed themselves more carefully from defilement contracted at the market, to wit, by not only washing their hands, but even by immersing their body."† In conformity with this, may the passage in Mark be rendered without the least violence to its language. In conformity with this, too, were the conveniencies among the Jews; accommodations for frequent ablution were every where ready.‡ Nor with their mode of dress, would the practice be so cumbersome as it would be among us.

---

* Se totos abluebant.

† Majori cura se purgabant a fori contactu, quippe non manus tantum lavando, sed et corpus mersando.

‡ Spencer de Legibus Hebræorum Ritualibus: p. 785. Ne quid itaque deesset quod purificationis tam frequentis ratio postulavit, Judaei fluvios, lacus, piscinas, et fontes passim obvios habebant, quibus munditiae operam daturi abluebantur.

That some of the stricter sort, that many, enough to justify the Evangelist's general expression, did practise total ablution on the occasion mentioned, is altogether credible. Kuinoel, however, in his commentary, asserts that the existence of such a custom among the Pharisees, is not sustained by sufficient arguments.* In the absence of clear, satisfying proof, it is not becoming to make any positive assertions. However striking the language of Mark may, by some, be considered, as recognizing such a practice (and the language is certainly coincident with such a practice, especially when we look at it by the investigations respecting *βαπτίζω* on the preceding pages), yet I am not disposed to urge it. But assuming the ground, that the evangelist did not intend to distinguish a total bathing from a partial washing, I again inquire, did he distinguish *one sort* of partial washing from *another sort* of partial washing, one of which sorts was performed by the dipping of the hands into water, and thus was properly expressed by the peculiar term (*βαπτίζω*) which he has employed? If so, this word is here used in its radical, proper meaning; and consequently, examined in its connexion, is so far from requiring, or justifying, Prof. Stuart's view of its meaning, that it is a decisive instance against his view.

I have already said, that the word (*βαπτίσωνται*) in this passage, may, without any violence, be considered as distinguishing a total immersion from a washing of the hands. I am by no means satisfied, however, that this is a necessary view of the passage. The verb is in the middle voice; and as there is no object expressed after it, it would be lawful in order to express the Greek, to employ, as Prof. Stuart has, the word *themselves* as

* On Mark 7 : 4.

being contained in the verb itself; so that the translation would be, "*except they immerse* or *bathe themselves.*" Still as the verb (νιπτωνται) in the former part of the passage, has, in the middle voice, an object (*χειρας, hands)* after it, it is certainly justifiable, though not necessary, to maintain that the verb in the latter part of the passage (βαπτισωνται) has the same word understood after it, for its object. The passage would then read, *The Pharisees... except they wash their hands oft, eat not ..... and when they come from the market, except they* IMMERSE, or BATHE, *their hands, they eat not.* The ambiguity in the Greek is much the same as there is in the following English sentence; *The Pharisees... except they wash their hands oft, eat not.... and when they come from the market, except they bathe, they eat not.* The word *hands* may be considered as understood after the word *bathe*, or the word *themselves* may be understood. The illustration is not a complete one, because we are not in the habit of distinguishing between different modes of washing the hands.

I proceed now to the inquiry, whether there were two sorts of washing of the hands, and what was the distinction between them. The following quotations exhibit all that I have to offer; and I present them the more readily, as they are selected from Pedobaptist writers.

Jahn in his Biblical Archaeology, § 329, makes the following statement. "The *washing of hands* before meals (a custom, which originated from the practice of conveying food to the mouth in the fingers), was eventually made a *religious duty;* on the ground that, if any one, though unconscious of the circumstance at the time, had touched any thing, whatever it might be, which was *unclean*, and remained unwashed, when he ate, he thereby communicated the contamination to the food also.

The Pharisees judged the omission of this ablution to be a crime of equal magnitude with fornication, and worthy of death.

"They taught that, if a person had not departed from the house, the hands, without the fingers being distended, should be wet with water poured over them, and then elevated so that the water might flow down to the elbows; furthermore, the water was to be poured a second time over the arms, in order that, (the hands being held down), it might flow over the fingers. This practice is alluded to in Mark 7 : 3, *ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται*" [except they wash their hands] "and is denominated by the Rabbins נָטַל. See Buxtorf's Chaldaic, Talmudic, and Rabbinic Lexicon, col. 1335. On the contrary, those who had departed from the house, *washed in a bath*, or, at least, *immersed their hands* in water with the fingers distended. The ceremony in this case (Mark 7 : 4) is denominated *ἐὰν μὴ βαπτίσωνται*" [except they immerse, or bathe], "and by the Rabbins טָבַל. See Buxtorf's Lexicon, col. 849."

Dr. G. Campbell, on Mark 7 : 3, 4, says; "For illustrating this passage, let it be observed, 1st, that the two verbs, rendered *wash* in the English translation, are different in the original. The first is *νίψωνται*, properly translated *wash*; the second is *βαπτίσωνται*, which limits us to a particular mode of washing; for *βαπτίζω* denotes *to plunge, to dip*." After quoting with approbation the following remark of Wetstein's, "*βαπτίζεσθαι* est manus aquæ immergere, *νιπτεσθαι* manibus affundere" [i. e. *βαπτίζεσθαι* is, to immerse the hands in water, *νιπτεσθαι*, to pour water on the hands] he proceeds; "This is more especially the import, when the words are, as here, opposed to each other. Otherwise *νίπτειν*, like the general word *to wash* in English may be used for *βαπτίζειν*, *to*

dip, because the genus comprehends the species; but not conversely βαπτιζειν for νιπτειν, the species for the genus. By this interpretation, the words, which, as rendered in the common version, are unmeaning, appear both significant and emphatical; and the contrast in the Greek is preserved in the translation." Accordingly, Dr. Campbell translates the passage thus; "*For the Pharisees .... eat not until they have washed their hands, by pouring a little water upon them; and if they be come from the market, by dipping them.*"

Rosenmuller, in his notes on this passage, speaks of two modes of washing the hands, namely, immersion of the hands in water, and, when one hand is washed by the other.*

Kuinoel also speaking of the opinion entertained by some, that a total ablution was performed in case of returning from the market, says, "But an *immersion of the hands*, duly performed, would have abundantly sufficed for this end," † that is, for purification from contact with the multitude.

Spencer, on the Ritual Laws of the Hebrews, speaks thus; "Some of the Jews ambitious for the credit of superior purity, frequently immersed their whole persons in water; the greater part, however, following a milder discipline, frequently washed only their hands, when they were about to take food. That the greater part, and especially the Pharisees, attended to this rite privately at home, and considered it a very important part of religion, is sufficiently evident from Mark 7: 3, 4. Hence it was that stone vessels for water [water pots, John 2: 6] were provided in every house of the Hebrews;

* Immersio manuum in aquam, et quum una manus abluitur altera.

† On Mark 7: 4.

so that all, when about to take food, might perform the frequent washings according to the discipline of the Pharisees. These vessels were very suitable for performing these daily purifications of the Jews; for it was customary among the Jews, sometimes to wash the hands by water poured upon them; at other times, to immerse the hands in water up to the wrist. The former mode of washing they expressed by נָטַל, the latter by טָבַל." *

From Lightfoot I gather the following. On Mark 7: 4, he says, "The Jews used נְטִילַת יָדַיִם 'the washing of hands,' and טְבִילַת יָדַיִם 'the plunging of the hands.' And the word νίψωνται 'wash,' in our evangelist seems to answer to the former,—and βαπτίσωνται, 'baptize' to the latter." . . . "Those that remain at home, eat not, . . . 'unless they wash the fist.' But those that come from the market eat not, . . . 'unless they plunge their fist into the water,' being ignorant and uncertain, what uncleanness they came near unto in the market." Then follows an extract from the Jewish writer Maimonides,

---

* E Judæis nonnulli, puritatis accuratioris laudem ambientes, se totos in aquas frequenter immergebant: plerique vero, disciplina mitiore usi, manus tantum, cum cibum capturi essent, frequenter abluebant. Hunc ritum plerosque omnes, Pharisæos inprimis, domi suæ privatim exercuisse, eumque in præcipua religionis partè posuisse, satis e S. Marci verbis [7 : 3, 4.] cognoscatur. Hinc factum est, quod ὑδρίαι λίθιναι (quarum meminit Evangelista) per singulas Hebræorum ædes disponerentur, quod scilicet omnes cibum sumpturi lavacris frequentibus e disciplina Pharisaeorum uterentur. Erant autem haec vasa ad quotidianas hasce Judæorum purificationes peragendas maxime accommodata: nam Judæis solenne erat, nunc χερνίπτειν, aqua affusa manus abluere, nunc βαπτίζειν, manus carpo tenus aquis emergere [immergere]; et lotionem priorem per נָטַל, posteriorem per טָבַל exprimebant. Spencer de Leg. Heb. Rit, p. 1175.

mentioning the quantity of water which was required for the ceremony of *plunging* the hands, viz. "a fit place; that is, where there was a confluence of forty seahs of water;" while for the *washing* merely, such exactness was not demanded. "The phrase therefore," Lightfoot adds, "seems to be meant of the 'immersion, or plunging, of the hands only.'" But, I remark, though it were only the hands that were plunged, yet the meaning of *βαπτίζω* is sufficiently obvious.

The observances here mentioned have been handed down among the Jews from age to age; and it is impossible to fix the precise point in their history at which they commenced. Certain it is, they shed light on such passages as the one under consideration; and could as appropriate illustrations be produced, in respect to many other passages of Scripture, on various topics, the Christian world would feel itself under great obligations.

The preceding copious examination helps us, of course, rightly to understand the quotation from Luke 11: 38, which is next brought forward to sustain the meaning *to wash*, ascribed to *βαπτίζω*; *But the Pharisee, seeing him, wondered that he had not first* WASHED HIMSELF (*ἐβαπτίσθη*) *before dinner:* Common version; *And when the Pharisee saw it, he marvelled that he had not first washed before dinner;* that he had not first *immersed*, that is, himself, or his hands. By the preceding part of the chapter it appears, that our Lord and his host had been exposed to a great mixture of company, and therefore needed, in the judgment of the Pharisee, the more formal and thorough sort of washing. On this passage too, Lightfoot observes, "there is נְטִילַת יָדַיִם 'a washing of the hands,' and there is טְבִילַת יָדַיִם a 'dipping of the hands.' This clause we are upon, refers to this latter. The Pharisee wonders, that Christ had not washed his

hands; nay, that he had not dipped them all over in the water, when he was newly come, ἐξ ἀγορᾶς, that is, ἐκ τῶν ὄχλων ἐπαθροιζομένων, ver. 29, *from the people that were gathered thick together.*"

To sustain the meaning *to wash*, three other passages are produced, by Prof. Stuart, which contain the substantive derived from the verb βαπτίζω.

"Mark 7: 4, THE WASHINGS (βαπτισμούς) *of cups and pots, and brazen vessels, and couches* (κλινῶν).

"Mark 7: 8, THE WASHINGS (βαπτισμούς) *of pots and cups.*

"Heb. 9: 10, *Only in meats and drinks, and divers* WASHINGS (βαπτισμοῖς)."*

That the word rendered WASHINGS in these passages ought, so far as philology is concerned, to be rendered IMMERSIONS, would be a plain inference from the preceding investigations. And even though a difficulty should seem to arise from the nature of some of the things mentioned by Mark, we ought, before we decide that the word must have another meaning, to inquire whether the supposed difficulties really existed in practice among the Jews. It is by no means satisfactory to refer to customs among ourselves, as suggesting difficulties in respect to what *the Jews* are said to have done, and especially, what they are said to have done by the influence of a misguided religious scrupulosity; for it was from religious, though mistaken, considerations, that they practised these observances. Nor were such observances entirely without foundation in the statutes of Moses. In Lev. 11: 32, it is directed, that any vessel upon which the dead body of an unclean animal had fallen, "whatsoever vessel it be, wherein any work is

* P. 310.

done, it must be *put into water*," in order to be cleansed. The only exception was in respect to earthen vessels, which, being thus polluted, were to be broken in pieces (v. 33). Now, how credible it is, and how accordant with the language of Mark, that the superstitious spirit of the Jews, in subsequent times, extended this requisition to other cases besides that of pollution by the touch of the dead; so that even on ordinary occasions, when they thought religion required the articles to be cleansed, the cleansing must be performed by immersing them in water.

And who can wonder, if this same spirit led them carefully to cleanse by immersion even the couches on which they reclined at meals? for it is these, probably, which are meant by the word translated *tables* in our version. It would certainly accord well with their superstitious disposition. And so far as the writings of distinguished men among the Jews enable us to form a judgment, those writings contribute altogether to the belief, that there was actually performed an immersion of these articles, when they needed special purifying. The Jewish rules, which Dr. Gill quotes in his commentary on Mark 7: 4, are precise in requiring such articles to be cleansed by being covered in water; and the regulations are exceedingly strict in regard to this washing, so that should there be any thing adhering to these articles, such as pitch, which might prevent the water from touching the wood in a particular spot, the washing would not be duly performed. The same Jewish authority requires even beds to be cleansed by immersion, when they had become defiled.

And what should hinder us from employing the word *immersions* in Heb. 10: 9? Immersions were practised by the Jews in accordance with the Mosaic ritual; and

why may we not consider the apostle, when naming the immersions, as taking a part, for the whole, of the legal purifications, and consequently as not departing from the specific, original meaning of the word he has employed?

2. The second meaning ascribed, in this section, to the verb *βαπτίζω* and to the noun derived from it, is a *figurative* meaning, "which deserves a particular consideration." *

The following passages are adduced as illustrating this meaning. "Luke 12: 50, *I have a baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitened until it be accomplished!* That is, I am about to be *overwhelmed* with sufferings, and I am greatly distressed with the prospect of them."* Here the proper, radical meaning of the word is sufficiently developed.

So in "Mark 10: 38, 39, *Are ye able to drink of the cup that I must drink, and to be baptized with the baptism with which I am baptized?* . . . . The sense is evidently the same as that given above, viz. 'Can ye indeed take upon you to undergo, patiently and submissively, sufferings like to mine—sufferings of an overwhelming and dreadful nature?'"*

Another example of this figurative meaning, Prof. Stuart finds in 1 Cor. 15: 29. *Else what shall they do who are* BAPTIZED *for the dead?* That is (though a different interpretation of the passage may be defended), "if there be, as some affirm, no resurrection to life, then what becomes of all our multiplied toils and sufferings, which we undergo with reference to a future state and to that world unto which the dead go? Of what avail is it to endure overwhelming sorrows, if there be no resurrection of the dead?"*

---

* P. 310.

"3. There is another *figurative* use of βαπτίζω, allied in some respects to the preceding one, but distinguished from it in the mode of its application. I mean that usage of the word, which employs it to designate the idea of *copious affusion* or *effusion*, in a figurative manner. The basis of this usage is very plainly to be found in the designation by βαπτίζω of the idea of *overwhelming*, i. e. of surrounding on all sides with fluid."

"Matt. 3 : 11. *He shall* BAPTIZE (βαπτίσει) *you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;* i. e. he will make a copious effusion of his Spirit upon a part of you; and another part, viz. the finally unbelieving and impenitent, he will surround with flames, or plunge into the flames."*

Examples of the same meaning are Luke 3 : 16; Mark 1 : 8; John 1 : 33; Acts 1 : 5; 11 : 17. By the language of these passages, especially as fully expressed in Matt. 3 : 11, and explained in Matt. 3 : 12, it is perfectly obvious how naturally and forcibly βαπτίζω [baptizo] expresses the idea of *overwhelming*, of *surrounding*. *He will baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire;* that is, some of you he will surround with the Holy Spirit's influences; and some of you, the unbelieving and impenitent, he will surround with flames. That such is the meaning of the passage, is plain from the 12th verse of the same chapter; and with this meaning the other passages agree, in which baptizing with the Holy Spirit is mentioned. The explanation which refers the *baptizing with fire* to the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, and which Prof. Stuart hints at as "*perhaps*"* being the right one, does not sufficiently regard the subsequent explanatory verse.

A passage very similar to those we are now consider-

* P. 311.

ing is "1 Cor. 12 : 13. *For by one Spirit have we been baptized into one body;* i. e. by the copious effusion of one and the same Spirit, have we been made members of one and the same church."* In other words, The same Spirit has baptized us all, so that we have all been made members of the same body; that is, we have all most copiously participated in the same Spirit's influences; an idea very naturally flowing from the radical meaning of βαπτίζω.†

I cannot but remark here, how strongly these figurative uses of the word βαπτίζω, especially in Luke 12 : 50, and Matt. 3 : 11, show what was the prevalent and popular meaning of the word—the meaning, which would first occur to a reader or hearer. If the word *baptize* in Greek corresponded, as to its prevalent and popular meaning, with our word *plunge*, or *immerse*, then the expressions in the above-named passages can be adequately explained. But if the word *baptize* in Greek, in its common and prevalent meaning, was equivalent to the English word *wash* without having annexed to it any notion of manner or copiousness, or if it meant *wash* as really and as frequently as it meant *plunge*, then such a figurative use would have been unnatural.

The examination of passages produced in this third section has led to the result, that the word βαπτίζω, as

* P. 312.

† In such passages, reference is made to the *abundant* communications of the Spirit; an idea very happily conveyed by the use of the word *baptize*. The *manner* of the communication is not regarded; only the *copiousness*. As I shall not have occasion to recur to this class of passages, I will now observe, though it is not altogether in place, that hence, so far as the *administration* is concerned, no argument can be drawn against immersion as being the only baptism, from the fact that the Spirit is elsewhere said to be *poured out*.

used in the New Testament without reference to the rite of baptism, does not depart from its prevalent meaning. Its significations, as thus used, are the following:

1. *To cleanse by immersing*, or *bathing*, *in water*.

2. *To overwhelm*, *to surround*, figuratively.

As the idea of *immersing*, *overwhelming*, *surrounding*, is naturally connected with the idea of *copiousness*, a third signification may here be introduced; namely, as expressing

3. *Most copious participation*.

In exhibiting the meanings of the word, however, this third signification may, without any impropriety, be dispensed with, as it savors too much of minute refining upon the meaning of popular language.

I have now examined the sections which may be considered as preliminary to "the main question." Let me bring together the results and present them in one view, restricting this view, as well I may, to the word βαπτίζω [baptizo].

Combining, then, the meanings of this word, as used, 1st, in the Greek classic writers; 2dly, in the Septuagint and the Apocrypha; 3dly, in the New Testament without reference to the rite of baptism, I thus present them:

1. *To dip*, *plunge*, *immerge* [*immerse*], *dip in*.

2. *To wash*, or *cleanse*, *by bathing*, or *dipping*, *in water*.

3. *To overwhelm*, *to surround*.

By the aid of these results, it is easy to trace some important resemblances between the Greek word *baptize* and our English word *immerse*, *dip* or *plunge*. The English word *plunge* or *dip*, has its own specific meaning, distinguishing it from other words which might be employed with reference to a liquid substance; so with the

Greek word. The English word *dip* may refer to the *dipping* of the *whole* person or thing, or to the *dipping* of *a part* of the person or thing, as the connection requires, while yet the distinctive meaning of the word remains; so with the Greek word. As a person, or thing, that has been *dipped in water*, may very properly be said to have been *washed in water* or *washed with water*, while yet no one concludes from this, that the words *dip* and *wash* are synonymous and interchangeable; so in Greek, a person or thing *baptized* may be truly said to be *washed*, and yet the word *wash* is not an adequate representation of the word *baptize*. As in English we speak of a person having *plunged into pleasure*, *being plunged into calamity*, *plunged into debt;* so in Greek, similar figurative uses of the word *baptize* are employed; and in both languages, the proper explanation of the term is drawn from its radical meaning. This same English word, *plunge* or *dip*, so perfectly well understood in popular intercourse, might, if investigated by a foreigner on the same principles, and in the same manner, which have been applied to the investigation of the Greek word *baptize*, be represented to be quite as indefinite and quite as dubious in meaning, as the Greek word is by some moderns represented.

SECTION FOURTH.

"*Do βαπτίζω and its derivatives, when applied to designate the* RITE OF BAPTISM, *necessarily imply that this rite was performed by* IMMERSION *of the whole person?*"

Under this general question, the article which we are considering proposes several particular inquiries.

§ 1. "*What is the proper force and signification of the word, according to the general usage of language?*"

The following paragraph contains the reply to this inquiry. "A review of the preceding examples must lead any one, I think, to the conclusion, that the predominant usage of the words *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω*, is to designate the idea of *dipping*, *plunging*, and *overwhelming*, and (in the case of *βάπτω*) of *tinging* or *dyeing*. But we have already seen in Nos. 6, 7, above respecting classic usage, that *βάπτω* is employed in the sense of *bathing* the surface of any thing with a fluid, and also of *washing* it. We have also seen in Nos. 2, 5, 6, of examples from the Septuagint and Apocrypha, that the word *βαπτίζω*, sometimes means *to wash;* and *βάπτω to moisten, to wet* or *bedew*. There is then no absolute certainty from usage, that the word *βαπτίζω*, when applied to designate the *rite of baptism*, means of course *to immerge* or *plunge*. It may mean *washing;* possibly (but not probably) it may mean, *copiously moistening* or *bedewing;* because words coming from the common root *BAΠ*, are applied in both these senses, as we have seen above."*

The conclusion here stated, is of course drawn from the significations of *βαπτίζω* [baptizo,] as given by Prof. Stuart in the preceding sections. If those significations require to be modified, the conclusion must in like manner be modified. My examination of Nos. 6 and 7 of examples drawn from classic usage, and of Nos. 2, 5, and 6, of examples from the Septuagint and the Apocrypha, shows that the conclusion above stated is not sustained; and that the word *βαπτίζω* is, in reality, sufficiently specific and definite to determine its meaning, when applied to designate the rite of baptism.

---

* P. 313.

Prof. Stuart here introduces a discussion, which a correct view of the proper force and signification of *βαπτίζω* renders in a great measure needless. The discussion relates to the different cases of nouns and the different prepositions used after the word *βαπτίζω*. The classic Greek writers frequently employ the Accusative case with the preposition *εἰς* [into] after this verb; and when thus employed by them, no doubt can be entertained that they meant to express the idea of immersing. In Mark 1 : 9, precisely this form of expression occurs; "Jesus . . . was baptized [immersed] *εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην*, into, or in the Jordan." But the sacred writers generally do not thus connect the verb with the Accusative and the preposition *εἰς*. Their prevalent manner is, to use the Dative case, either with or without the preposition *ἐν (in, by, with)* after this verb. The inquiry suggested by this departure of the sacred writers from the more common usage of the classic writers, is, (not whether *εἰς* and *ἐν*, (*into* and *in*) may not be synonymous, especially in the New Testament, as they both correspond to the Hebrew preposition בְּ, but) whether the inspired writers did not "intend to avoid a description of the *manner* of the rite, by forms of expression which designate merely the *means*, without marking the *manner*." Prof. Stuart is *not confident that such was their intention*;* but yet, although Mark 1 : 9 is so entirely in accordance with classic use as expressing the idea of immersion, he cannot think it "quite safe to build with confidence upon" this "solitary example;" particularly considering that the preposition *εἰς* may, in certain connections, rather mean *at* than *into*. Thus it is "a *possible* construction" of this passage in Mark, that it was

* P. 314.

intended to convey no other meaning than that Jesus was baptized "AT *the river Jordan.*" Of this, however, he entertains "some doubts," and seems rather disposed to favor the opinion that the expression in Mark "may designate no more than the element *with which*, or *by which*," [not IN *which*] "John performed the rite of baptism." Some passages are quoted; they contribute, however, but little, if any thing, to the purpose, as they do not exhibit the preposition εἰς in such connections as the passage in Mark places it. Remarkably apposite as is this passage to show, that the word βαπτίζω has a meaning sufficiently definite to imply that the rite of baptism was performed only by immersion, he yet seems to conclude that as this is a "*solitary example*," it ought not to be considered as adding "confirmation to the supposition of such a meaning." *

The discussion of this point is not so lucid, nor is Prof. Stuart's opinion of the passage so clearly stated, as might have been expected. Indeed, it may well be considered a hopeless undertaking to reconcile this passage in Mark with any other representation, than that Jesus was immersed in, or into, the river Jordan.

The discussion, I have said, is in a great measure a needless one. I will assign my reasons.

1. The word βαπτίζω is more specific and definite than Prof. Stuart has represented it; and it is an improper extension of its meaning, that is fundamental in this particular discussion. Let this error be corrected, and the discussion would have no place. Instead of the preposition influencing the meaning of the verb, it is rather the verb that should decide the meaning of the preposition. That is, granting that the prepo-

* Pp. 315, 318.

sition here used, may perhaps, in certain connections, mean *at* rather than *in*, or *into*, it is yet far from being a just conclusion that the verb, here employed, does not necessarily mean *to immerse;* but on the contrary, because the predominant meaning of this verb is confessedly *to immerse*, it is a fair conclusion that the ordinary meaning of the preposition, *in*, or *into*, must be retained.

2. The sacred writers not unfrequently use εἰς where from more common usage we should expect ἐν; that is, the one preposition is used for the other without any very obvious design; compare Mark 2 : 1. 13 : 9. 13 : 16. Luke 11 : 7. John 1 : 18. This may have resulted in their usage from the influence of the Hebrew preposition בְּ, to which both εἰς and ἐν correspond, and which requires to be rendered *in*, *into*, *by*, or *with*, &c. in different connections. As this one preposition in Hebrew has so extensive a meaning, it might be supposed, as we actually find, that in Hebraistic Greek there would be some interchanging of these prepositions, both of which so nearly correspond to the same Hebrew preposition.

3. The classic writers use both of these forms of expression; and a distinction between βαπτίζω followed by εἰς, and βαπτίζω followed by ἐν, or by a Dative without any preposition, is not in their use perfectly and uniformly obvious, so as to establish a principle in the language. Even the examples produced by Prof. Stuart,* in which βάπτω is followed by a Genitive case, with a preposition or without one, do not direct the mind to the *means*, (the ocean, or a stream, for instance, with which any thing is bathed), so far as to prevent the mind from noticing *the profuse quantity* of the means. Thus, in the example from Aratus, Phaenom. v. 951, *bathes herself* ποταμοῖο, WITH the *river*.

* P. 316.

The examples of *βαπτίζω* and *βάπτω* followed by a Dative,* with or without a preposition, show that the distinction, if ever made, was not universally regarded. The expression, "*Dipping it* IN *wine*, (*ἐν οἴνῳ*) *they drink it*," Aristotle, Hist. Anim. VIII. 29, does not essentially differ from the expression, *Dipping it* INTO *wine*, (*εἰς οἶνον*). In the example from Aristophanes, "*They dip the wool θερμῷ* IN *warm water*, the Dative is used without a preposition. But may not this use be explained by considering the preposition, *ἐν*, as understood before the Dative? Thus this example would resemble the preceding one. Nor is the mind so much directed to the *material*, namely *warm water*, as to lose sight of the *profuseness* and *thoroughness* of the washing, or dipping. So with the other examples.

4. Even were the distinction in classic use fairly sustained, Prof. Stuart has himself said in another part of his article† (whether with perfect propriety or not, I need not here examine), "Classical usage can never be very certain in respect to the meaning of a word in the New Testament. Who does not know, that a multitude of Greek words here receive their colouring and particular meanings from the Hebrew, and not from the Greek classics?"

In regard to the expression in Mark 1: 9, *ἐβαπτίσθη . . . εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην*, *was baptized* INTO, or IN, *the Jordan*, which seems to have suggested this discussion, I am not at all anxious to prove, that the preposition *εἰς*, here employed, does add material strength to an argument in favor of immersion. The use of *εἰς*, in itself considered, that is, without considering the proper force of *βαπτίζω*, might be explained by a reference to other pas-

* P. 316. † P. 382.

sages which show that Mark did not always nicely discriminate between the two prepositions, εἰς and ἐν. The use of this preposition, in the present instance, is indeed in perfect accordance with the proper meaning of βαπτίζω; so that the preposition might naturally be suggested by the verb. Just as in English, it would be perfectly natural to say, *he was immersed* or *dipped* INTO *the river;* while yet it is equally common to say *he was immersed*, or *dipped*, IN *the river.* Again, if controversy were kept out of sight, and regard were paid simply to facts in the usage of language, not one scholar in a thousand would hesitate to render εἰς as here situated, by *in* or *into.* Still the expression, used by Mark, is not materially different from the expression ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ; just as, in English, there is no material difference between the expression, *he was immersed* INTO *the Jordan*, and the expression, *he was immersed* IN *the Jordan.* It is, after all, the meaning of the verb which must guide us; and this, I trust, has been shown to be sufficiently specific and definite.

After this discussion, which is both a needless and an unsuccessful one, Prof. Stuart declares himself "philologically compelled" to conclude, "that the probability that βαπτίζω implies *immersion*, is very considerable, and on the whole a predominant one; but it does not still amount to certainty. Both the classic use and that of the Septuagint shew," he says, "that *washing and copious affusion* are sometimes signified by this word. Consequently, the rite of baptism may have been performed in one of these ways, although it is designated by the word βαπτίζω."*

This statement, however ample its acknowledgments may appear to some, requires alteration. For among

* P. 318.

all the examples adduced by its author from classic writers to illustrate the meaning of *βαπτίζω*, and among all the significations furnished by him, I have searched in vain for the signification *washing* and *copious affusion*.* The examples from the Septuagint and the Apocrypha adduced to sustain the meaning *to wash*, do by no means support that meaning, while the meaning of *copious affusion* does not occur among the alleged Septuagint uses of this word. Prof. Stuart had, probably, in his mind, while writing the sentence above quoted, the significations, "*to smear over* or *moisten* by dipping in," and, "*to moisten, wet, bedew*," ascribed by him to *βάπτω* [bapto] in the Septuagint; and perhaps he intended these to be considered as equivalent to the signification, *copious affusion*. On these alleged significations I have already sufficiently remarked in the preceding section. That "the rite of baptism may have been performed" by washing or copious affusion, is not then sustained by actual usage. And even if, in some instances, the word might be rendered *wash*, it would no more be a necessary consequence that *baptize* and *wash* are synonymous, than it would be a necessary consequence that *immerse* and *wash* are synonymous, because we can speak of a thing as *washed* which has been *immersed*.

Prof. Stuart concludes this topic with the acknowledgment (an acknowledgment, which ought to have been

---

* I confine this remark to *βαπτίζω* [baptizo], for this is the word now under consideration. The only apparent exception to the remark is, the instance which occurs under number 6, of meanings in classical use. But that is only an *apparent* exception.

The meaning *to wash* is indeed ascribed to *βάπτω* [bapto]: but the idea of *dipping* is unquestionably connected with this meaning. See number 7, of meanings in classical us[illegible].

expressed in stronger terms), "On the whole, however, the probability seems to be in favor of the idea of *immersion*, when we argue simply from the force of the words or expressions in themselves considered."* In view of all the preceding philological investigations, and with regard *solely* to philological necessity, I may rather ask, Does the force of the word *βαπτίζω*, in itself considered, permit us to depart from the idea of immersion?

§ 2. "*Circumstances attending Baptism.*"

"*Do the circumstances which attend the administration of the rite of baptism, as related in the New Testament, cast any light upon the* MANNER *of the rite itself?*"

Two passages are here introduced, on which dependence is sometimes placed as being decidedly favorable to the practice of immersion; namely, Matt. 3: 16, *And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water;* and Mark 1: 10, *And straightway coming up out of the water.*

"The question has been raised," Prof. Stuart says, "whether this means 'Went up out of the water of the river,' i. e. rose up after being plunged into the river, and came out of the water."† That it does not mean the *rising up from underneath the water* after having been immersed into it, he shows by three considerations. "1. The rite of baptism was completed, before John [Jesus] went up from the water." 2. "The verb" used by the Evangelists (*ἀναβαίνω*) "will hardly permit such an interpretation." The proper verb to express the rising up from under the water, and the "one continually employed by the ecclesiastical fathers, in order to designate emerging from the water" is *ἀναδύω*, "which means *to come up out of*," "or *to emerge from.*" 3. "The pre-

* P. 318. † P. 319.

position," employed by the Evangelists, "will not allow such a construction."*

It is then stated as "a clear case, that Jesus retired from the water of the river, by going up its banks. Nothing more can properly be deduced from it."*

Prof. Stuart seems not to have correctly apprehended the precise bearing of these verses upon the question in hand. The expressions, *went up out of the water*, and *coming up out of the water*, or as the preposition might be rendered '*from* the water,' are not understood by those in opposition to whom he wrote, as referring at all to the action of *arising from underneath the surface of the water;* but to what took place after Jesus had thus arisen, namely, his retiring to the bank from the spot in the river where he was baptized; that is, his coming out of, or from, the water. This would, of course, be a coming up, an ascending, from a lower place to a higher. This, I presume, is the meaning generally ascribed to these expressions; not that, against which the arguments above stated are directed. This meaning also agrees with common usage in speech, and is not contrary to the original text. Whether the expressions, disconnected from the train of discourse, might not be otherwise understood, is a question of little moment. Nor will I undertake to say, that this is incontrovertibly their meaning. Suffice it to say, that this meaning violates no principle in language, and is not at all forced; and that these verses are altogether favorable to the belief that an immersion was performed, because, in addition to the meaning of the word βαπτίζω, the persons mentioned resorted to a *river* in order that baptism might be administered. On this last point, I am happy in being

*P. 320.

able to employ the language of Prof. Stuart. When speaking of baptism performed "at or in some stream," he asks, "What other good reason for this can be given, excepting that immersion was practised?"*

The next passage, on which any comments are made, under the head of Circumstances attending Baptism, is John 3 : 23, *And John also was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there : and they came and were baptized.*

"The question is," Prof. Stuart says, "Whether John baptized at Enon near Salim, because the waters were there abundant and deep, so as to afford convenient means of immersion ; or whether the writer means merely to say, that John made choice of Enon, because there was an abundant supply of water there for the accommodation of those who visited him, for the sake of being baptized and of hearing the powerful addresses which he made to the Jews.† . . . I cannot avoid the belief," he concludes, "that ὕδατα πολλὰ [much water, or many waters] is designed, as Beza says, to designate *many streams* or *rivulets*. John chose a place abounding in these, when he removed from the banks of the Jordan, in order that the multitudes who flocked to him might be accommodated."‡

The impression which this verse naturally makes on a reader is, that John repaired to Enon near to Salim, because it afforded facilities for baptizing. This obvious meaning of the verse is displaced by several writers, and the Evangelist is supposed by them to mean, that John repaired to Enon because the abundant supply of water found there would be very favorable for accommodating his hearers during their attendance upon his

---

* P. 357. † P. 321. ‡ P. 324.

preaching. In other words, it was not so much for the convenience of baptizing the proper subjects of baptism, as it was for accommodating the people and their beasts. To this opinion Prof. Stuart assents, as is above stated, and he believes that the words, *much water* [literally, *many waters*] were intended to signify *many streams* or *rivulets*. The authority of Beza, "one of the most acute judges of Greek idiom,"* is introduced as sustaining this meaning of the phrase.

It is, perhaps, to be lamented, that sacred geography furnishes no testimony in regard to Enon near to Salim. The precise situation of these places is now unknown. But without making any conjectures as to the circumstances of John's hearers, or as to the length of time which individuals and companies might have spent in their attendance upon him, and without dwelling on the geographical improbability that in Palestine or its immediate vicinity, there were many streams so near to each other as this interpretation would imply, the verse itself is sufficiently plain to an unbiassed reader. If the Evangelist meant to say, that John went to this place because it was a remarkably favorable place for baptizing the converts, how could he more plainly have expressed himself?

An attempt is made to show from philological considerations, that the words translated *much water* designate, in accordance with Beza's opinion, *many streams*, or *rivulets*. Hence the conclusion is drawn, that "John chose a place abounding in these . . . in order that the multitudes who flocked to him might be accommodated." If it must be so then, be it so, that instead of the words *much water*, there should be the words *many streams*.

* P. 323.

How does this affect the statement of the Evangelist? *John was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there were* MANY STREAMS *there; and the people came and were baptized.* Streams and rivulets are certainly very suitable for the administration of baptism.

But the philological investigation, by which Prof. Stuart arrives at the conclusion that ὕδατα πολλὰ [many waters] means *many streams*, is altogether unsatisfactory. It is by no means an appropriate one. He examines the meaning of ὕδωρ, [literally rendered *water*], and finds reason to believe that it sometimes means *a river*, or *stream*, as well as *water* in general; he also shows that the plural ὕδατα [*waters*] means *rivers* or *streams*. Then "the natural and primary meaning of πόλυς [πολλὰ] is *many* in opposition to *few*."* The result, then, would seem to be, that ὕδατα πολλὰ [*many waters*] means *many streams* or *rivulets*.

Now this may seem plausible; but after all, it is incorrect. All the premises separately taken, are doubtless true; but the conclusion is not true, because the manner of investigation is not adapted to the case in hand. It is the *compound term*, or the phrase, ὕδατα πολλά [many waters], that ought to be examined, in order to discover whether it should be rendered, as Beza directs, *many streams*. There needs be no discussion about the meaning of the word ὕδατα [waters] separately taken, or of πολλὰ [many] separately taken. It is *the phrase*, which philology should investigate. Now all the numerous passages which Prof. Stuart brings forward to illustrate the idiom of the language, are really inappropriate, with the exception only of Rev. 1 : 15. 14 : 2. 17 : 1, 15. 19 : 6. All the rest might have been

* P. 324.

spared. It may also be mentioned, that Matt. 17 : 15, to which reference is made * as containing the word ὕδατα, does not contain it. This oversight, however, may perhaps be accounted for, from the circumstance that the parallel passage in Mark does contain the word.

As to the explication of the phrase ὕδατα πολλά [*many waters* or *much water*], there are two considerations to which regard should be paid.

1. It is a phrase peculiar, in the New Testament, to John; and it occurs sufficiently often in his writings to enable one to form a correct opinion of its meaning. We need not then go beyond the writings of John in the New Testament to obtain the materials of information. Examine Rev. 1 : 15. 14 : 2. 19 : 6. It is perfectly obvious, that, in these passages, the sacred writer had in mind an abundant mass of water, agitated by storm and roaring as the voice of thunder. But, it is said, the "waves of the sea are successive, and (so to speak) different and broken masses of water; not one continuous mass, deep and abundant .... It is the movement, the division, the succession, and the motion which form the ground of this idea." † Is this, I ask, a natural and probable representation? Who can believe, that the sacred writer indulged in such a refining of thought? It is not the language of a metaphysical writer, but of one whose loftiness of conception and ardor of thought could not be detained by such minute refining. It was an abundant mass of water "into" thundering "tempest wrought," that the writer employed to express what he had heard.

The same phrase occurs in Rev. 17 : 1, 15. Here, too, the idea of abundant water happily agrees with the

---

* P. 322. † P. 322.

context. The idea of streams and rivers is utterly inappropriate. The city of Rome is here spoken of, with special reference to its widely extended dominion, and its connection with all the kingdoms of the then known world. In order to place before his readers Rome thus connected with all nations, and sending through them all a corrupting and destructive influence, the writer describes it as a wealthy and luxurious city, situated upon, or near the sea, and possessing every facility for commercial intercourse. The city, thus situated, is represented to the reader, according to frequent Scriptural usage, as a female. Not that Rome actually was in the immediate vicinity of any great body of water; it is the image, a flourishing city favorably situated for intercourse with the nations, to which we must direct our attention. And in order to convey to the mind an idea of a magnificent and luxurious city spreading its ruinous influence through the known world, what image so appropriate, as that of a great commercial mart which would attract the kings of the earth and the inhabiters of the earth? In this view, the *many waters* as meaning *a sea* are remarkably suitable. Whether the image presented to the mind, if *many waters* mean *many streams* or *rivers*, be a natural and appropriate one, may be determined by embodying before the mind's eye the representation thus furnished, namely, a woman sitting on "many streams or rivers of water." *

In all the places then of the New Testament, which furnish examples of this phrase, *many rivulets* would not answer the writer's purpose as a translation of the phrase; but obviously he had in mind *abundant masses* of water.

---

* P. 322.

I might here take leave of the phrase; but there is a second consideration in regard to it which I will present from a desire that a full view of this case may be exhibited.

2. The style of John is peculiarly Hebraistic; and the phrase ὕδατα πολλὰ [many waters] is to be ranked among his Hebraisms. The usage of the Septuagint, then, and the corresponding phrase in Hebrew, will contribute to a satisfactory explanation. In the Hebrew Bible, the word translated *water* is not used in the singular number; a literal translation of the word would be always *waters*, and when the idea of abundant water, or of large masses of water, is to be expressed, the adjective employed corresponds to the noun in being of the plural number. The phrase מַיִם רַבִּים [*many waters*] is of frequent occurrence, and is literally translated in the Septuagint by the phrase ὕδατά πολλὰ [*many waters*]. This Greek phrase is accordingly found in various passages of the Septuagint version. An examination of the Septuagint with reference to this phrase, furnishes the following results. In 2 Sam. 22 : 17. Ps. 18 : 16. Ps. 29 : 3. 32 : 6. 77 : 19. 93 : 4. 107 : 23. 144 : 7, the phrase occurs, and in not one of these places does the idea of "many rivulets" correspond to the connection; but clearly the idea is expressed of *abundant water*, and in all, except Ps. 29 : 3, is the idea also contained of *overflowing* water. In Jer. 51 : 13 [Sep. 28 : 13, Heb. 51 : 50], it again occurs where it manifestly means the Euphrates together, probably, with the lakes and canals formed from the Euphrates in the vicinity of Babylon.

Such is the Septuagint use of this phrase; a use to which the Evangelist was accustomed, and by which he was guided. There is, then, only this one instance, in Jeremiah, in which there is even a remote resemblance

to Beza's rendering of the phrase. Remote this may well be called, even if it were not the Euphrates by itself considered, rather than as connected with the lakes and canals, that was occupying the writer's mind.

There is one passage, which might suggest to some the idea that there were, properly speaking, *rivers* in the immediate vicinity of Babylon. It is Ps. 137 : 1, *By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down.* To those who are acquainted with the geography of that region, this presents no difficulty. By the word *rivers*, the canals fed by the Euphrates are meant.

The general usage of the Septuagint is manifest. I need not say, to what conclusion this usage compels us in translating the phrase ὕδατα πολλά [*many waters*], as used by a writer so Hebraistic as John. *Much* or *abundant water*, is a faithful translation; while the phrase *many rivulets*, or *streams*, would do violence to general usage.

This conclusion is confirmed by the fact, that, for the most part, in the usage of the Septuagint, the phrase ὕδατα πολλά [*many waters*] and the phrase ὕδωρ πολὺ [*much water*] are not materially different from each other. In the following passages, Is. 17 : 12, 13. 23 : 3. 28 : 2. Ezek. 1 : 24. 26 : 19. 27 : 26. Sol. Song 8 : 7, the phrase occurs in the singular number [*much water*], although the corresponding Hebrew phrase is in the plural; so that the same Hebrew phrase may be rendered either by the singular number, or by the plural. That is to say, in the usage of the Septuagint, *much water* and *many waters* are equivalent expressions. Nor in the passages quoted above, is there any perceptible reason why the singular is preferred. For in those passages, it is the *abundant*, the *overwhelming*, the *roaring* water, or waters, or masses of water, to which allusion is made; and

which are certainly expressed in other places by the plural phrase.

Somewhat similar to this frequent usage of the Septuagint, there is an instance in the New Testament. In this instance, the adjective does not occur; still it furnishes evidence, that the plural ὕδατα [*waters*] and the singular ὕδωρ [*water*] might be used interchangeably. Compare Matt. 17 : 15 with Mark 9 : 22. The two Evangelists are here relating the same transaction, and they mention the same circumstances. Matthew, however, employs the word *water* in the singular number, while Mark uses the plural. The English version translates literally, thus; Matthew says, *Ofttimes he falleth into the fire and oft into the* WATER, ὕδωρ; Mark says, *Ofttimes it hath cast him into the fire and into the* WATERS, ὕδατα. Doubtless, both Matthew and Mark meant the same thing.

As shedding at least a ray of light on this subject, I wish to present, in connection, two passages from the Old Testament. Jer. 41 : 12 [Sept. 48 : 12], *They found him* [Ishmael] *by the* GREAT WATERS *that are in Gibeon;* GREAT WATERS, מַיִם רַבִּים the same words which are so frequently translated MANY WATERS. What is meant by this expression in Jeremiah? What were the GREAT WATERS in Gibeon? Compare 2 Sam. 2 : 12, 13, 14. *And Abner, the son of Ner, and the servants of Ish-bosheth the son of Saul, went out from Mahanaim to Gibeon. And Joab the son of Zeruiah, and the servants of David, went out, and met together by the* POOL OF GIBEON; *and they sat down, the one on the one side of the* POOL, *and the other on the other side of the* POOL. *And Abner said to Joab, Let the young men now arise, and play before us. And Joab said, Let them arise.* It is certainly a very natural inquiry, Are not the GREAT, or the

MANY WATERS, or, as the Septuagint here translates, the MUCH WATER, mentioned in Jeremiah, the same as the POOL mentioned in 2 Samuel? Without replying myself to this inquiry, I quote the following sentences from Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, recently revised and edited by Prof. Robinson, of the Andover Theological Seminary. See under the word GIBEON. "It is said, (2 Sam. 2 : 13) that there was a pool in Gibeon. Whether it were of any considerable extent, does not appear from this passage; but there is little doubt that it is the same as the 'great waters that are in Gibeon,' Jer. 41 : 12." Here then the phrase מַיִם רַבִּים, to which ὕδατα πολλά [*many waters*] literally corresponds, indicates a body of water sufficiently large indeed for two hostile companies to be on opposite sides without encountering each other, and yet sufficiently small to admit of persons speaking to each other from the opposite sides.

What now is the result of this protracted investigation? Briefly this. In the New Testament use of the phrase, laying aside, for the present, the passage in the Gospel of John, *abundant water* is expressed, not *streams* or *rivulets*. In the Septuagint use of the phrase, it is not *streams* or *rivulets* that are indicated. With these statements before us, can we reasonably doubt as to the meaning of the phrase in the Gospel of John? If philology is to decide the question, does it not furnish ample evidence, that the phrase does not mean *many rivulets*, or *streams;* but that it rather means *a considerable body of water?* A philological investigation, properly conducted, is fatal to Beza's rendering of the phrase.

I undertook this investigation, however, not because I thought it would decide the question *why John resorted to the place* mentioned, but to satisfy my curiosity and to let others know what are the facts. Nothing material is

gained, as to the question which some, in my opinion very needlessly, raise. If there were many streams at that place, it would be a very convenient place for baptizing, as well as for accommodating the hearers and their animals. If there were at that place, as philology teaches, a considerable body of water, that too would be very suitable for baptizing, and perhaps quite as suitable for the other purposes. On this question, then, let the sacred writer himself speak; and let common sense exercise its plain honesty in understanding the very simple and intelligible declaration: *John was baptizing in Enon near to Salim, because there was much water there; and they* [the people] *came and were baptized.*

One word more. Beza is referred to, as a person of much authority and as having pronounced that the phrase in question means *many rivulets* or *streams.* Now Beza arrived at his conclusion, so far as appears from this article, in the same way essentially as did the author of the article. He referred to Matt. 3 : 16, in which place the word *water* plainly means the *river* Jordan; the consequence, it would seem, was then drawn, that the word ὕδατα [*waters*] means *rivers, streams.* On the inappropriateness of this mode of investigation in the present instance, I have sufficiently remarked. Beza is also mentioned as "one of the most acute judges of Greek idiom;" and consequently his decision would seem to be of great moment. Now I abhor the disposition that would, for any purposes, detract from any man's just reputation: I also count it wrong to strengthen a weak cause by an appeal to names, especially when any exceptions can be taken as to the qualifications of the man, to whose authority the appeal is made. But unwilling as I am to draw any man's "frailties from their dread abode," it is certainly the dictate of justice and of

candor, that readers should have knowledge respecting the men who are held up as oracles. "Beza," then, "with natural talents considerably above the middle rate, had a good deal of learning, and understood well both Greek and Latin; but he neither knew Hebrew (though he had the assistance of some who knew it), nor does he seem to have been much conversant in the translation of the Seventy [the Septuagint]. Hence it has happened, that his critical acuteness is not always so well directed as it might have been. The significations of words and idioms are often determined by him from classical authority, which might with greater ease and more precision have been ascertained by the usage of the sacred writers and their ancient interpreters."* Whether in explaining the phrase ὕδατα πολλά [many waters], his critical acuteness was so well directed as it might have been, may easily be decided by those who have attended to the preceding investigation of Septuagint use.

Again; Beza is said to have been "too violent a party man to possess that impartiality, without which it is impossible to succeed as an interpreter of holy writ."† Prof. Stuart also says of him in reference to another topic, "His zeal against the Anabaptists misled him."‡ Perhaps, too, it misled him on this; for such was his zeal against those who were called Anabaptists, that he names them among certain religious sects whom he calls *monstra hominum* [monsters of men]. §

---

* Dr. G. Campbell's Preliminary Dissertations. Diss. X. Pt. V. § 3.

† Id. Diss. X. Pt. V. § 4.

‡ P. 387.

§ Dr. G. Campbell, Diss. X. Pt. V. § 12.

The passage that next claims our attention as showing some circumstances connected with baptism, is Acts 8 : 36—39. It relates to the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch by Philip. *As they went on their way, they came unto a certain water . . . . and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip.*

In his remarks on this passage, Prof. Stuart has fallen into the same mistake as in his remarks on Matt. 3 : 16. That is, he labors under the impression that the act of *going down into the water*, as our version expresses it, is understood by those against whom he is writing, as being the *act of immersion;* and the *coming up out of the water*, as being the *emersion*, or the *rising up from under the surface* of the water. Now it is very possible, that some persons *may* have cherished such a notion. But how they could have acquired it, is to me unknown; for our English version represents that the baptism took place *after* the descent into the water. For myself, I say, this notion never entered my mind till it was introduced by the representations which some advocates for infant sprinkling felt themselves at liberty to make, respecting the sentiments of those whom they were opposing; nor do I recollect ever having heard a Baptist express this notion. So different is it from what I believe to be the current opinion respecting this passage, that some may think me guilty of a mistake in representing a distinguished scholar as combating this notion, and as taking advantage from it against those whose opinions he is controverting.

I beg leave, however, to quote the language of Prof. Stuart. He says, "I have another remark to make on κατέβησαν ἀμφότεροι εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ, *they* BOTH *went down to*

the water. This is, that if *κατέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ* [*they went down to*, or *into the water*] is meant to designate the action of *plunging* or *being immersed into the water*, as a part of the rite of baptism, then was Philip baptized as well as the eunuch; for the sacred writer says, that BOTH *went into the water*. Here then must have been a rebaptism of Philip; and what is at least singular, he must have baptized *himself*, as well as the eunuch." *

Very true, I add. But on whom does the absurdity of such consequences rest? It is a mere assumption, against which the remark is directed.

Again he says; "All these considerations together shew, that the *going down to the water*, and *the going up from the water*, constituted no part of the rite of baptism itself; for Philip did the one and the other just as truly as the eunuch. As then neither the language allows us to construe the passage as signifying *immersion* and *emersion*, nor the circumstances permit us to interpret the passage thus, we have no good and sufficient grounds here to consider this example as making any determination with respect to the mode of the baptismal rite." †

Throughout his remarks on this passage, Prof. Stuart blends together two things that are perfectly distinct; namely, *the going down into the water*, and *the immersion into it.* That the going down into the water was the immersion, no one believes; the immersion, *after* the descent into the water, is expressed by another word, *he* BAPTIZED *him.*

The proper question to be discussed on this passage, and a question which ought to be considered apart and by itself, is, whether the sacred writer meant to say, that Philip and the eunuch actually went down INTO the

* P. 326 † P. 326.

water, that is, descended to such a distance into the water as was requisite for immersion; or whether he meant only to say, that they went down TO the water, that is, to its margin.

Prof. Stuart vindicates this latter view. His reasons are, 1. The preposition here employed [εἰς], means *to* and *towards*, as well as *into*. 2. The verb here employed [καταβαίνω], when analyzed, rather expresses the *movement down to* a place, than the *entrance into* the place. The entrance, however, into the place, he says, "may sometimes be included by popular diction."* To these reasons he appends the remarks which I have already examined.

The opinion which Prof. Stuart has adopted is not, I observe, a necessary consequence from these two reasons. The preposition here used, and which our English version renders *into*, certainly has the meaning *into*, as well as the meaning *to* and *towards*. Again, the language of Luke is that of "popular diction," and not that of philosophical analysis; thus, by Prof. Stuart's own acknowledgment, the idea of entrance *into the water* may be included in this expression. Allowing, as every one ought to allow, that the preposition here used has in various places the meaning *to* and *towards*, as well as *into*, and allowing that the preposition *in itself considered* cannot decide the question proposed, there yet is no insuperable objection to its being here rendered *into;* and there is no insuperable objection to the clause being rendered, *they went down both* INTO *the water*.

But are there any positive reasons in favor of thus rendering the clause? There are. 1. The verb here employed [καταβαίνω], when followed by the preposition

* Pp. 325, 326.

used in this passage, includes almost uniformly in the New Testament the idea of entrance *into* the place mentioned. I refer to the following passages. John 2 : 12. Acts 7 : 15. 14 : 25. 16 : 8. 18 : 22. 25 : 6. These all resemble each other. Without expressing each of them in English, let it suffice to mention one or two: *Jesus went down* TO *Capernaum;* is it not clearly implied that he went INTO Capernaum? *Jacob went down* TO *Egypt;* did not the speaker and the writer mean, he went INTO Egypt, and not merely to the border of it? So of the rest. Our common mode of speech illustrates the phraseology; *I am going* TO *Boston*, means, that I intend to go INTO the city.

Similar to these passages are Rom. 10 : 7, Eph. 4 : 9. I ought also here to mention Luke 10 : 30, *A certain man went down from Jerusalem* TO *Jericho;* his intention, regarding the language as that of common life, was to *enter* the latter city as well as to go *towards* it. Acts 8 : 26 should here be mentioned; *the way going down from Jerusalem* TO *Gaza;* that is, leading INTO Gaza, just as the road TO Boston leads INTO Boston.

I refer to two additional passages. Luke 18 : 14; Did the publican *go down* merely TO his house? Can we avoid the idea of his *entering* the house? Mark 13 : 15; *Let him that is on the house top not* [καταβάτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν] *go down* INTO *the house;* then by an intensive repetition of the thought, the Saviour adds, *let him not enter therein to take away any thing from his house.*

There are two passages in which this same preposition is used in connection with this verb, but in which the nature of the case would seem to exclude the idea expressed by the preposition *into.* Luke 8 : 23. *There came down a storm of wind* ON *the lake* [κατέβη . . . εἰς τὴν λίμνην]. Rev. 13 : 13. *He maketh fire come down from*

heaven ON *the earth* [καταβῇ εἰς τὴν γῆν]. But is there any thing in the nature of the case, that would indicate an impropriety in rendering Acts 8:38, *they went down* INTO *the water?*

Such is the usage of the New Testament. If necessity does not compel us to such a rendering of the passage in Acts, such a rendering is, to say the least, a justifiable one.

As showing that this rendering is, at least, a justifiable one, I wish to present a passage which occurs in the Gospel by John, 6:16, 17. Jesus, after having miraculously fed the multitude, retired to a mountain, so as to avoid the ill-timed movements of the people who wished to force upon him the assumption of regal power. His disciples, after evening had come in, left the place to go to Capernaum. They were to go by water. They *went down*, then, UNTO, or TO *the sea, and entered into the boat.* The same verb is here employed, as is used in the passage we are considering. But how does the sacred writer express their going down TO the sea? By using the same preposition which Luke has employed in his account of Philip and the eunuch? No. His language is, κατέβησαν ἐπὶ τὴν θάλασσαν; not εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν; in English, as nearly as I can here represent the difference, *they went down* TO *the sea;* not INTO *the sea.*

2. A second reason (I adduce it as confirmatory merely, as *favoring*, not in itself deciding), a second reason, which favors the usual rendering of the passage in the Acts, *they went down* INTO *the water*, not simply TO the water, is found in the 39th verse, *they came up* OUT OF *the water.* The preposition ἐκ is here used; the proper, distinctive meaning of which is, *out of*, and which implies that the persons had gone *into*, or been *in*, and afterwards came up *out of*, the place mentioned. To ex-

press this idea, the preposition here used is precisely the word that would be selected. Prof. Stuart himself says, in his remarks on Matt. 3 : 16, that this preposition is the proper word "to indicate a movement *out of* a liquid, into the air." *

True, he says again in his remarks on the passage which we are now considering, that this preposition "by no means of necessity implies" this idea. But this observation possesses no force in this connection. It was occasioned by the mistake into which Prof. Stuart was somehow betrayed, of supposing that the verb rendered *come up* is understood, by those whose opinion he was controverting, to mean the *rising up from under* the water, and that it is this assumed and incorrect meaning of the verb that makes the passage valuable to the advocates of immersion. At the same time, his mind was occupied with the opinion, that this verb [*αναβαινω*] expresses the *going up the bank. Assuming* this, without proof, to be the idea expressed by the verb, the preposition [*ἐκ*], as connected with this verb, must then, of necessity, receive a different meaning from its ordinary one, so as to be conformed to this assumed meaning of the verb.

But since this opinion of Prof. Stuart's respecting the verb *αναβαινω*, cannot be proved true, and since no one understands this verb as expressing the action of *rising up from under* the water, the ground on which rests his proposed departure from the acknowledged ordinary meaning of the preposition, does not exist; and we are therefore brought back at once to the natural and usual meaning of the word. The preposition may be understood in all its natural and ordinary force, in perfect accor-

* P. 320.

dance with the usual meaning of every other word in the passage, and without exposing a single word to be misunderstood or misapplied.

I have great pleasure in saying, that this manner of explaining Prof. Stuart's departure from his own acknowledgment as to the meaning of this preposition, relieves this departure, in a great measure, from any just charge of a want of candor. It originated partly in his mistake, as to the opinions of others; partly, in his assumption, as to the idea expressed by a certain verb.

The reasons which I have now produced certainly favor the belief, to say the least, that Philip and the eunuch actually descended INTO the water, in order that, while in the water, baptism might be performed. And while these reasons *favor* such a belief, there are no valid objections *against* the belief.

And now what is the bearing of this passage upon the question of baptism? Simply this. In order that Philip might baptize this new convert, *they both went down into the water;* and why should they go down into the water, if an immersion was not to be performed? It is in the light of a very strong confirmation, that this passage is employed as sustaining the practice of immersion.

From this passage, which as to the circumstances connected with the baptism seems sufficiently clear, light is reflected upon Matt. 3 : 16, and Mark 1 : 10. In these passages Jesus is said to have come up *from*, or *out of*, the water, after having been baptized. The preposition, however, employed in the original of these passages, is not so definite and specific as the preposition used by Luke. But placing these two instances of baptism together, the phraseology in regard to which is so similar, one can scarcely doubt that Matthew and Mark, though the preposition they use is not so precise

as the one used by Luke, yet meant to convey the idea that Jesus, after having been baptized, *came forth out of the water to the bank.* Thus, according to an important principle of interpretation, the clearer language of Luke in this instance sheds light upon the less clear language of Matthew and Mark.

I will only add that, in view of the persons concerned going off from the margin to a convenient spot in the river for the sake of baptism, it is not at all surprizing that Mark should have related that Jesus was baptized (that is, immersed) εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην INTO *the Jordan.*

Let us now pause a moment, and see distinctly to what conclusions the preceding investigations have led us. They are briefly these. The proper meaning of the word βαπτίζω [baptizo] is, *to immerse, to bathe, to overwhelm;* and no example which has been produced requires a departure from this primary signification; certainly not such a departure as loses sight of this signification. In the scriptural accounts of the administration of baptism, which have thus far been considered, the circumstances happily agree with this meaning of the word; for baptism is mentioned in connection with repairing to a *river*, and in connection with *much water*, and it was also performed *within* the river, at some distance from the water's brink.

I have now arrived at Prof. Stuart's interpretation of Rom. 6 : 3, 4, and Col. 2 : 12. These passages, every one knows, hold an important place in the discussions respecting baptism. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that, like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." Col. 2 : 12. "Buried with

him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God who hath raised him from the dead."

The interpretation which I now proceed to examine, is extracted by its author from his recent Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. The point which he endeavors to establish is, that the burial, here mentioned, is not "a literal burial under water;"* but that Christians are here said to be dead and buried only in a *moral* or *spiritual* sense; that is, that the apostle's expressions were not modified by what took place in the external administration of baptism; or, in other words, that the apostle made no necessary allusion to the mode of the baptismal rite.

I feel compelled to say, that the author's commentary on these verses fails to give satisfaction, and is liable to serious objections. The more frequently and the more attentively I examine it, and the more carefully I peruse the apostle's language, the more deep is my conviction that the commentary is not a proper representation of the original.

In order to bring this part of the discussion fully before the reader, I shall present a translation of the first eleven verses of the sixth chapter of this epistle, with a brief view of the apostle's design and meaning. This will be followed by an examination of the commentary on the passage.

Romans, 6 : 1—11.

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? By no means. How shall we, who are dead to sin, live any longer in it? Know ye not, that so many of us as have been

---

* P. 329.

baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? We have then been buried with him by baptism into his death; that, as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glorious power of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been allied to him in the likeness of his death, so shall we be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, so that we should no longer be in subjection to sin; for one who is dead is freed from sin. But if we be dead with Christ, we believe that we shall live with him; knowing that Christ, having been raised up from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him. For in that he died, he died in respect to sin once for all; but in that he liveth, he liveth in respect to God. Thus also consider ye yourselves dead indeed in respect to sin, but alive in respect to God, through Christ Jesus.

The expressions, *baptized into Jesus Christ*, and *baptized into his death*, require explanation. These phrases are more usually considered as meaning, *baptized into an acknowledgment of Jesus Christ*, with an implication of subjection or discipleship to him;* and, *baptized into an acknowledgment of his death.* The commentary proposes a somewhat different explanation: thus; "As many of us as have been baptized into Jesus Christ;" that is, "as many of us as have become devoted to Christ by baptism;" "or taken upon as a peculiar relation to him by being baptized."† *We have been baptized into his death;* "that is, we have, as it were, been made partakers of his death by baptism," "we have engaged to die unto sin, as he died for it; we have a communion or participation in death to sin."‡

I prefer the more usual and more simple explanation. The expression *baptized into death*, or *into his death* [εἰς τὸν θάνατον], may be compared with the expression which occurs in Matt. 3 : 11, *I baptize you unto repent-*

* P. 327. † P. 328. ‡ P. 328.

ance [εἰς μετάνοιαν], that is, *into repentance.* The meaning of this declaration I understand to be this, *I baptize you into an acknowledgment of repentance; so that by this baptism you acknowledge yourselves to be in a state of repentance;* in other words, by submitting to this baptism you profess repentance and bind yourselves to a life of amendment. So, *to be baptized into the death of Christ*, is to be baptized *into an acknowledgment of his death* and into an acknowledgment of the obligations resulting from that death.

I subjoin, for the sake of clearness, the following free and paraphrastic translation.

What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? By no means. How shall we who have become dead in respect to sin, live any longer subject to it? Do ye not know, that so many of us as have been baptized into an acknowledgment of Jesus Christ, were baptized into an acknowledgment of his death, or have by our baptism engaged to die unto sin, as he died for sin? By baptism, then, which acknowledges his death, we have been buried, as he was buried; that, as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glorious power of the Father, so we also having been raised up from our burial, should lead a new life. For if we have become like Christ as to his death, that is, if, as he died *for* sin, we have died *to* sin; we shall be also like him as to his resurrection; that is, as he arose to a new and heavenly life, so shall we lead a new and holy life. This obviously follows from what we know; namely, that as Christ was crucified, so our inward carnal man has been subjected to a moral crucifixion for the destruction of our sinful propensities, so that we might no more be in subjection to sin. For a person, who has departed this life, who is dead, is freed from the temptations and sins of the present life. Now if we have died to sin, as Christ died for sin, we believe that as he arose to a new life, we shall also lead a new life; knowing that Christ, having been raised up from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no longer dominion over him. For in that he died, he died on account of sin once for all, so as to destroy its power; but in that he liveth, he liveth in respect to God, so as to advance his

glory. In like manner also consider ye yourselves dead in respect to sin, but alive in respect to God, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The design of the apostle in these verses was, to meet an objection which might be raised against the statements of the preceding chapter. In that chapter, he had largely shown that the grace of God vastly superabounds over the sins of men; and that the abounding of sin had proved an occasion of the superabounding of divine grace. If this be the case, some one might say, may we not still go on to sin, so that God's grace may still more abundantly be exhibited? The apostle's reply is very simple. It consists of two parts; 1. The internal character of Christians forbids such an objection; *they are dead to the influence of sin.* 2. Their external profession of Christianity opposes it; *by their very baptism they have, as being dead to sin, symbolically been buried and raised up again*, thus making an acknowledgment, that, as Christ was buried and rose again to a heavenly life, so they, as his followers, having by baptism been buried and raised again, were bound to lead a new, a spiritual life.

It is contended, that the burying, mentioned by the apostle, is not an external one, but an internal, a moral burying; and that this phrase, *we are* BURIED, is used only to express more strongly the idea of having become dead. This opinion seems effectually opposed by the circumstance, that the burying is performed *by baptism*, an external rite. The preposition, which is here employed in the original, leads us to this view. It is *διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος* BY *baptism* that we are buried, not AT our baptism. It is not, that baptism merely furnished a suitable occasion for showing our being wholly disinclined to sin, so that, when we professed Christianity, we might be said to be buried in respect to sin; but

baptism is here represented as *the very thing*, *the very instrument*, or, more properly, *the very act*, BY which, or, BY MEANS OF which, we were buried. The apostle seems to present two things, a death and a burial, which are clearly kept distinct; and the burial is an external thing, consisting in the fact, that we have been baptized into an acknowledgment of Christ's death. To continue in sin would, then, be inconsistent with our character and our religious profession. It does not seem an adequate representation of the apostle's language to say, that having become dead to sin, we have completed this work of moral dying by publicly professing Christianity and promising at baptism to renounce sin; so that by our consummating the work of dying we may consider ourselves as buried. He seems to say, that besides having become dead to sin, we have also been buried by baptism into an acknowledgment of Christ's death.

This very obvious view is too much disregarded. If the apostle had simply said, we are dead to sin and are buried in respect to it, or we are dead and buried in respect to sin, his language would require a different interpretation. But the apostle himself explains what he means by *burying*, when he adds, *by baptism*, *διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος*. It is with much pleasure I here avail myself of the language of my respected colleague, Prof. Chase, in a note attached to his sermon on the Design of Baptism.

"*Buried with him by baptism.* The language is figurative. The word *συνετάφημεν* means '*we were interred*, or *covered up in a grave*, or *laid in a tomb*,' or *buried with* Christ. How? *By baptism*, the apostle adds; and this addition modifies the figure, and makes the sense as clear as it is possible for express words to make it. *In*, or *by baptism*, then, Paul and the Christians

whom he addresses were *buried.* To be crucified to the world, or dead to sin, is the character of the Christian; but to be buried with Christ by baptism, is the appointed emblematical *profession* of that character. The apostle does not teach that believers are *crucified* with Christ, or are *dead* with Christ, or possess a *mortified* temper, *by baptism.* To have such a state of soul, to be dead in respect to sin, is one thing; and to be buried with Christ *by baptism*, is quite a different thing; for this is external, whereas the other is internal. The one is a sign; the other, the thing signified. It is only by confounding what the apostle has kept distinct, that there can be any mistake concerning this passage."*

But let us examine in detail the arguments by which Prof. Stuart would show, that the burying here mentioned, has no necessary reference to the immersion of the early Christians.

---

* It is important to bear in mind, that the burying is performed by baptism, and thus refers to an external act. This thought will remove the obscurity which Scott's commentary throws around this passage. In attempting to show that the words, *we are buried with him by baptism*, do not require immersion as necessary to baptism, he says, 'we are also said to be crucified with Christ, and circumcised with him.' Mr. Scott, I apprehend, has fallen into an error as to the last expression, 'circumcised with him,' that is, Christ. I have searched in vain for this expression in the Scriptures. As to the expression, 'we are crucified with Christ,' it is substantially correct. But the verse in the Epistle to the Romans, now under consideration, does not contain the simple expression, 'we are buried with him;' but, 'we are buried with him *by baptism*.' Now to make the other passage parallel with this it ought to be, not simply, 'crucified with Christ;' but, 'put to death with Christ by crucifixion.' A comparison of these forms of expression clearly shows, that something peculiarly significant was intended by employing the phrase 'buried with him *by baptism*.'

The first argument is, 'that in the verse before us there is a plain *antithesis;* one so plain that it is impossible to overlook it. If now συνετάφημεν [*we are buried with*] is to be interpreted in a *physical* way, i. e. as meaning baptism in a physical sense, where is the corresponding *physical* idea, in the opposite part of the antithesis or comparison? Plainly there is no such *physical* idea or reference in the other part of the antithesis. The *resurrection* there spoken of, is entirely a *moral, spiritual* one; for it is one which Christians have already experienced during the present life.'*

In regard to this, I observe, that there is a corresponding physical idea in the opposite part of the antithesis. It is not, indeed, expressed in words, but so far as the thought is concerned, the antithesis is complete. *We have been buried in a baptismal grave, that we should lead a new life.* The imagination instantly supplies the idea of a resurrection; *having been raised up from this grave*, we should lead a new life. I take it for granted, as does the commentary,† that in the fourth verse, the word ἐγερθέντες [*having been raised up*] is implied. This word renders the antithesis complete, as to verbal expression; *we have been buried with him by baptism, that, having been raised up, we should lead a new life.* On the one hand there is a moral death and an emblematical burial; on the other, an emblematical resurrection and a holy life.

But the commentary says, that the *resurrection* here spoken of, 'is entirely a *moral, spiritual* one; for it is one which Christians have already experienced during the present life.' True; this resurrection is, or rather *was* in the case of the early Christians, experienced in

* P. 328. † P. 329.

the present life. This circumstance, however, is of no weight in showing that the resurrection is a spiritual one; for a physical resurrection from the baptismal grave may be experienced in the present life, as well as a spiritual resurrection from the death in trespasses and sins. And that the resurrection implied in this verse is a physical one from the baptismal burial, is sustained by the passage in the Epistle to the Colossians, 2 : 12 ; *Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead:* that is, by your faith in the power of God who raised up Christ from the dead, ye have IN BAPTISM *been buried with him, and risen with him.* It was IN BAPTISM, then, a physical act, they had been both BURIED and RAISED UP with Christ.*

* I know, that by thus referring the *being buried* and the *being raised* up, to the word *baptism*, I must understand the words ἐν ᾧ [*wherein*] as referring to βαπτίσματι [baptism]; and I perceive that Prof. Stuart on page 327, gives the following translation; "with whom also ye have been raised up (or have arisen) by faith, through the power of God, who raised him from the dead." But his translation of these words is very questionable. In the first place, the antithesis between συνταφέντες [*being buried with*] and συνηγέρθητε [*ye are risen with*], would suggest that ἐν ᾧ [*wherein*] has the same connection with the latter verb, that ἐν τῷ βαπτίσματι [*in baptism*] has with the former participle. In the second place, it is plain that αὐτῷ [*him*] is understood after συνηγέρθητε [*ye have arisen with*]. Supply αὐτῷ after this verb, and it becomes very obvious that ἐν ᾧ [*wherein*] relates to βαπτίσματι [*baptism*]. This view of the passage is the same as our common version presents; and our version corresponds, in this instance, with the ancient Syriac. Storr, also, in his expository dissertation on the Epistle to the Colossians, translates the passage in a similar manner. His translation is the following: Sepulti cum eo in baptismo, in quo etiam una cum illo a mortuis excitati estis. Opuscula Academica, Vol. 2, p. 157.

The meaning of this whole passage may thus be expressed; ye

Second argument. 'Nothing can be plainer, than that the word συνετάφημεν [*we are buried with*] in Rom. 6 : 4,

---

11, 12. 'By whom ye have been circumcised with an internal circumcision, namely, the laying aside of carnal propensities, by the circumcision which Christ enjoins, having, as an indication of this, been buried in baptism as he was buried; wherein also [in which rite] ye have through faith in the power of God, or through belief of the power of God, who raised him from the dead, been raised up as he was raised up.' This passage and the similar one in the Epistle to the Romans, very beautifully harmonize, and unite in showing an internal death to sin experienced by believers, and an outward emblematical burial which indicates their faith in the power of God as manifested in the resurrection of Christ from the dead.

The translation which I have proposed of Col. 2 : 12, is somewhat different from that which Prof. Stuart has given on the page above mentioned, namely, 'ye have been raised up by faith, through the power of God, who raised him from the dead.' A comparison of this version with the original will certainly make one pause before he adopts it. The word rendered *power* is not so connected with the word rendered *raised up*, as to warrant the expression, *ye have been raised up through the power of God;* and yet his version conveys this idea. The word rendered *power* is immediately connected, in the genitive case, with the word rendered *faith*. Accordingly in another place, Prof. Stuart renders the verse thus; "*We* [*ye*] *have arisen with him by faith* WROUGHT BY *the power of God.*"

That the original is capable of this latter version, no one can doubt who is acquainted with Hebrew usage, and with that of New Testament Greek, in regard to the genitive case. This case is used with very great latitude, and requires, in conformity with the connection and circumstances, a great diversity of renderings. But are the circumstances and the connection, in the present instance, such as to require a departure from the more usual and the appropriate meaning of the genitive? I think not; and according ly I translate the verse without any departure from the appropriate meaning of this case; or with so slight a departure that it scarcely deserves to be named; *ye have been raised up with him through belief of the power of God who raised him up;* or, *ye have been raised up with him through belief*, or *faith, in the power of God who raised him up.*

is equivalent in sense to the word ἀπεθάνομεν [*we be dead*, Eng. version] in v. 8.'*

I reply by acknowledging, that to me this is not plain. There are two methods of satisfactorily accounting for the use of the expression *if we be dead*, in the 8th verse. 1. The apostle, having stated that Christians had become dead to sin, and had been buried by baptism, may have afterwards used the word *dead*, as including all that had taken place, internally and externally, respecting their moral death. They needed not to be reminded on every occasion, that they had also been symbolically buried. Being buried is so intimately connected with being dead, that the expression *being dead*, would, especially in such a connection as this, recall the other idea. 2. But there is another very sufficient reason for the apostle's using this term. The preceding verse, the seventh, had presented a new thought; namely, a person who has departed this life, who is *dead*, has no longer a connection with the sins of this life. Now, applying this thought, the apostle speaks of Christians as *dead* and as having no more connection with the sins of their former state; but as living a new life, as Christ is now living a heavenly life. It is not then plain, that the words *if we be dead*, in the 8th verse, are equivalent in sense to the words *we are buried*, in the 4th verse.

Third argument. 'The image or figure of *immersion*, *baptism*, is nowhere else in Scripture employed as a symbol of *burial in the grave*.'†

Reply. This argument would have force, could it be shown, that a writer must employ the same comparison more than once. Is it necessary that a certain mode of viewing a subject, or a certain comparison in regard to

---

* P. 329. † P. 330.

it, should be repeated, in order to show what the writer intended? Is it not enough that the comparison, or the figure, be apt and striking? I think, however, the same image is employed in Col. 2 : 12. The remarks on this last mentioned text, in the commentary, are not convincing. And although the passage in Colossians might, if it stood entirely alone, be explained otherwise than as referring to a baptismal burial, since the words *in baptism* might, as Prof. Stuart suggests, be understood as meaning *at baptism*, yet even this cannot be said when we compare it with the parallel passage in Romans, where the preposition διὰ, *by, by means of*, is used. And here it becomes us to remember that important principle in interpretation, that of two parallel passages, if one contains an ambiguous expression, while the other is free from ambiguity, the former must be explained by the latter unambiguous passage.

Prof. Stuart adds, 'Nor can I think it [immersion] a very natural symbol of burial. The obvious import of *washing with water*, or immersing in water, is, that it is symbolical of purity, cleansing, purification. But how will this aptly signify *burying in the grave*, the place of corruption, loathesomeness and destruction?"*

I reply; if we do not carry the comparison beyond just limits, immersion is certainly a natural symbol of burial; and has commended itself as such, to persons of all classes and of all degrees of mental cultivation. There is the being placed underneath the surface of the water, as the body of Christ was placed underneath the surface of the earth. If one insists, that a burial must signify corruption, loathesomeness and destruction, then I may say, though the demand is unreasonable, that in

* P. 330.

our baptismal burial we emblematically deposit our moral corruption, and when we rise from this grave, we leave our moral loathesomeness behind, and rise to lead a new and holy life.

It is very possible for a person's mind to be so intent upon the idea of purity, as indicated by baptism, that he will discern in this ordinance no other significancy. But the passage which we are now considering, presents an additional significancy in baptism. The idea of purity is, by no means and never, to be overlooked; in connection, however, with that, baptism is to be regarded as reminding us of the *manner in which purity is attained*, namely, through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ; and as impressively reminding us, that we too must die *to sin*, and that we must arise *to a holy life*. Thus, as enforcing the thought of *purity procured through the death and resurrection* of Christ, it is a symbolical burial in respect to sin, and a symbolical resurrection to a new and holy life; it is the appointed act, by which we profess our subjection to Christ who died for sin, who was buried, and who rose again to a heavenly life. Thus it is a token of our recognizing Christ's death, and burial, and resurrection on account of sin.

In the commentary it is asked, 'what else but a *moral burying* can be meant when the apostle goes on to say: *We are buried with him* [not by baptism only, but] *by baptism* INTO HIS DEATH?'*

The force of this question is not obvious. How the addition of *its being in reference to the Saviour's death* that we are buried by baptism, whether as acknowledging his death and resurrection for sin, or as professing a com-

* P. 330.

munion with him in death to sin—I say, how this addition hinders the burial from meaning our real, physical baptism, does not appear.

It is added in the commentary, 'of course it will not be contended, that a literal, *physical* burying is here meant, but only a *moral* one.' *

A burying *physical* in *some* sort, is here intended; not indeed the burying in a real grave of a dead body, but the burying in a baptismal grave of a person who has become dead to sin. The expressions here employed, seem clearly to show that reference is made to baptism, not only, in the language of the commentary, 'because when that rite was performed, the Christian promised to renounce sin and to mortify all his evil desires, and thus to die unto sin, that he might live unto God;' but also, because the submitting to baptism was an acknowledgment of discipleship to a Saviour who had died on account of sin so as to destroy it, and had risen again to a heavenly life; and because baptism was also an emblem of the Christian's resemblance to the Saviour *as to his death*, in that the Christian too has died, not indeed for sin, but unto sin; and of the Christian's resemblance to the Saviour, *as to his resurrection*, in that the Christian too has arisen, not indeed to heavenly glory, but to a holy life.

The author of the commentary concludes by observing, 'I cannot see, therefore, that there is any more necessary reference here to the *modus* of baptism, than there is to the *modus* of the resurrection. The one may as well be maintained as the other.' †

In how extensive a sense the word *modus* [mode] is here used, I know not. But it seems plainly the thought of the

---

* P. 330. † P. 330.

apostle, that as in baptism there is a being placed underneath, so there is a being raised up; and thus there is emblematically indicated in baptism, not only a burial, but also a resurrection. Hence he says, 'we, by baptism into his death, have been buried with him, or, as he was buried; that as Christ was raised up from the dead, so we [having been raised up] should lead a new life.' Just so in Col. 2 : 12, 'buried with him in baptism, wherein, in which rite, or in which emblem, ye are risen with him.' The *mode* of the resurrection is implied here so far as the leaving of the grave, the rising up from it, is concerned. There is, in fact, reference both to burial and to resurrection; to the being deposited underneath, and the being raised up.

As a conclusion of this already, perhaps, tedious discussion, I will produce the views of a few writers who cannot be suspected of undue partiality to the sentiments which prevail generally among the Baptists. I quote from one of the notes attached to Prof. Chase's sermon on the Design of Baptism.

"Jaspis, in a note on this part of his Latin version of the Epistles, acknowledges the truth, though he afterwards makes a feeble attempt to escape from the legitimate consequence. He says, 'Paul in this place alludes to the custom then usual, of immersing the whole body; which immersion resembled the laying of a man in a sepulchre.' p. 33.

"The remarks of Rosenmuller on the same passage, are worthy of serious consideration. 'Immersion in the water of baptism, and coming forth out of it, was a symbol of a person's renouncing his former life, and, on the contrary, beginning a new one ..... The learned have rightly reminded us, that, on account of this emblematical meaning of baptism, the rite of *immersion* ought to

have been retained in the Christian church.' See his *Scholia in Novum Testamentum*, vol. iii. p. 454.

"Such, too, was the conviction of Luther, in view of this passage, who, after speaking of baptism as a symbol of death and resurrection, says, 'On this account I could wish that such as are to be baptized, should be completely immersed into water, according to the meaning of the word, and the signification of the ordinance; not because I think it necessary, but because it would be beautiful to have a full and perfect sign of so perfect and full a thing; *as also without doubt it was instituted by Christ.*' See his work entitled *Captivitas Babylonica*, in the collection *Omni. Oper.* M. LUTHER. Tom. ii. p. 76. ed. 1551."

I dismiss the passage which has occupied me so long, by quoting the following remarks of Knapp, in his Lectures on Christian Theology. Speaking of Rom. 6 : 3, 4, and Col. 2 : 12, 13, he thus expresses the apostle's idea; "We are, like Christ, buried as dead persons by baptism; and should arise like him to a new life." He adds; "The image is here taken from baptized persons as they were *immerged (buried)*, and as they *emerged (rose again)*; so it was understood by Chrysostom. Since immersion has been disused, the full significance of this comparison is no longer perceived." *

Having presented his reasons for believing, that the sixth chapter of the epistle to the Romans furnishes no definite information respecting the apostolic mode of baptism, Prof. Stuart proposes the following inquiry: "Are there not some circumstances related or implied, in the passages respecting Christian baptism, which seem

* Knapp's Theology. By Leonard Woods, Jr. Vol II. p. 527

to render the idea *improbable* that immersion was generally, or at least universally practised?"*

The following passages are selected by him as presenting improbabilities; Acts 2. Acts 10 : 47. 16 : 33. 22 : 16. I do not deem it important to enter into a statement of these improbabilities. It would only lead me to repeat what has been said again and again, on the one side and on the other. Suffice it to say that, in regard to all these supposed cases of improbability, the concession is fully made by him, that there is nothing which utterly forbids the belief that immersion was practised. On the first passage brought forward, he says, "However, I concede that there are some points here, which are left undetermined, and which may serve to aid those who differ from me, in replying to these remarks. It is true that we do not know, that baptism was performed by the apostles only, nor that all the three thousand were baptized before the going down of the sun. The work may have extended into the evening; and so, many being engaged in it, and more time being given, there was a possibility that the work in question should be performed, although immersion was practised." †

On Acts 10 : 47, after proposing the somewhat licentious interpretation, 'Can any one forbid that *water should be brought in*, and these persons baptized;' he says, "I admit that another meaning is not necessarily excluded, which would accord with the practice of immersion." ‡

On Acts 16 : 33, speaking of a bath in the jail, and representing "such accommodations in the prisons of ancient days" as "very improbable" (though such a convenience might be granted to the jailor's family, if not to

* P. 332. † P. 333. ‡ P. 334.

his prisoners, and his house would seem to have been in the immediate vicinity, at least, of the prison,) Prof. Stuart yet says, "the possibility of this cannot be denied."*

A careful examination of the sacred writer's account, suggests no improbability as to this instance of baptism. The following appears to have been the order of events. Paul and Silas were thrust into the inner prison; an earthquake occurred; the jailor sprang in and fell down before Paul and Silas; he brought them out; they spake to him and to all that were *in his house;* he then washed their stripes: baptism was next performed; after which he brought them *into his house.* After instruction, then, had been given *in the house*, baptism was performed; and after baptism, the company *returned to the house.* Did they not leave the house, in order that baptism might be administered? And why did the administration of baptism require them to leave the house?

On Acts 22 : 16, after mentioning *washing* or *washing off* as the manner of the baptism, he observes, "Still I acknowledge that this is not a necessary conclusion; for bathing or immersion would produce the effect of *washing off.*"†

The passage, 1 Cor. 10 : 2, *And were all* BAPTIZED *unto Moses* IN THE CLOUD AND IN THE SEA, is next mentioned, as seeming "of necessity to imply, that immersion is not essential to the idea of baptism."‡ Still, after stating the whole case, he leaves the passage with this remark; "Yet as the language must evidently be figurative in some good degree, and not literal, I do not see how, on the whole, we can make less of it, than to sup-

* P. 335. † P. 335. ‡ P. 335.

pose that it has a tacit reference to the idea of *surrounding* in some way or other."*

"The suggestion has sometimes been made, that the Israelites were *sprinkled* by the cloud and by the sea, and this was the baptism, which Paul meant to designate. But," says Prof. Stuart, "the cloud on this occasion, was not a cloud of rain; nor do we find any intimation that the waters of the Red Sea sprinkled the children of Israel at this time."†

It has always been surprizing to me, that this passage should be resorted to, in opposing immersion as requisite for baptism. The language is evidently figurative, and is intended to represent the Israelites, not as being *literally baptized*, but as submitting themselves to the special authority and guidance of Moses, as Christians, when baptized, submit themselves avowedly to Christ. It has reference to a period, which might justly be regarded as an era, or starting point, in their history; a time, when they made a very signal surrender of themselves to Moses as the servant of God. Some of the circumstances connected with this surrender of themselves to Moses, are remarkably similar to the circumstances connected with the public surrender of believers to Christ, as their leader and deliverer. To the Israelites might be applied, in a figurative manner, language which, in its literal application, belonged to Christians. The explanation of the figure is perfectly easy. By baptism, Christians avow their confidence in Christ, their choice of him and their subjection to him, in all the offices which he sustains. Now, if a community had yielded themselves up to some leader, placing confidence in him and professing subjection to him, and especially

---

* P. 336. † P. 336

if, at the time of thus yielding themselves to him, any circumstances had occurred similar to those in which Christians professed their subjection to Christ, they might very happily be said to have been baptized unto, or into, that leader. The Jewish community sustained such a relation to Moses as has here been mentioned, and a circumstance of the kind alluded to, took place. As Christians, in making their profession of allegiance to Christ, are surrounded with water, so the Israelites, when signally showing their allegiance to Moses, by passing through the Red Sea, were surrounded with water. What though it was not actually over their heads? What though they were not touched by the water? Yet, who feels that this figurative language is at all unsuitable, or difficult to be understood? And which is the proper method of interpretation?—to employ this confessedly allusive mention of baptism for a satisfactory explanation of the Christian ordinance? or, to learn what the Christian ordinance was, and from that to ascertain what the allusive application of it means?

"That *washing* was at least one method, and perhaps even the more ordinary one of practising baptism, may be thought," says Prof. Stuart, "to find some support in such passages as the following."* Eph. 5 : 26, *that he might . . . cleanse it* WITH THE WASHING OF WATER; Titus 3 : 5, *by* THE WASHING *of regeneration;* Heb. 10 : 22, *having . . . our bodies* WASHED *with pure water.* But in regard to them all, he acknowledges, there is nothing inconsistent with immersion, inasmuch as washing, or cleansing, is an effect of immersion. Such passages present no difficulty, when it is considered that the sacred writer had principal respect to the effect, represented

* P. 336.

by baptism. Besides, the Greek word employed in these passages is the word which rather designates *bathing*, *washing of the person* or *body*, than *a partial washing*, as of the hands, or feet, or face.

In this connection a remark occurs, which deserves a passing notice. Prof. Stuart says, that "baths are not usually adapted to such a purpose"* as total immersion. If this remark was intended to be applied to places for bathing, as they were prepared in the times of the apostles, it is not only destitute of evidence, but it is against evidence. The conveniences for bathing in ancient times, were remarkably ample.†

Thus closes the discussion concerning the circumstances attending the administration of baptism, as re-

---

* P. 337.

† I here introduce on account which may illustrate the use of a bath for total immersion. While my colleague, Prof. Chase, was in the city of Rome, during the month of March 1833, he became acquainted with an English gentleman, whose thoughts had been seriously directed to the subject of religion, and who "had made up his mind to dissent from the ecclesiastical establishment of England." "I called upon him," says Prof. Chase; "and an acquaintance ensued, that soon encouraged me to regard him as a suitable subject for baptism. He had for a considerable time desired it; for, by reading the Scriptures, he had been convinced of the duty of believers, in this respect. There was water near, in a spacious and well-furnished bath; and he could say, as the Ethiopian traveller did to Philip, 'What doth hinder me to be baptized?' The case was a special one; and it was clear that it ought to be met in a corresponding manner. Accordingly, a time was appointed; the use of the bath was secured; and, at the allotted hour, the service was performed with an humble reliance on the approbation of that almighty and compassionate Saviour, who was perfectly acquainted with the intolerance of the Papal Government, and with all the circumstances." American Baptist Magazine, Vol. 13. p. 344.

lated in the New Testament, and concerning the references to baptism. The conclusion which Prof. Stuart thinks justified is, that the mode of the ordinance is not determined by the sacred writers. While he concedes, that none of the circumstances related, or implied, absolutely determine that immersion was not practised, yet he has a "*persuasion*" that some of the circumstances "render it improbable that immersion was always practised;" and considers "it as quite plain, that none of the circumstantial evidence, thus far, proves immersion to have been exclusively the mode of Christian baptism."*

That such would be his conclusion, every one might anticipate from his statements concerning the meanings of the verb translated *baptize*, and from the manner in which he disposes of the apostle's reasoning in the sixth chapter of the epistle to the Romans. But if he has erroneously stated the meanings of βαπτίζω [baptizo], and if his manner of treating the passage just mentioned is incorrect, then there is required a different conclusion. Besides, it is not reasonable to demand, that all the circumstantial evidence should, by itself considered, *prove* immersion to have been exclusively practised. It is enough, if that evidence does not lead the mind clearly to any other act, if it is in perfect accordance with immersion, and if it thus coincides with the proper meaning of the word used to express the ordinance.

I may ask, then, in view of the examination to which his positions have been subjected, what is the real state of the case? It is this. The word, which expresses the Christian ordinance, employed in its proper, ordinary meaning, has a certain sense; in all the places, in

* P. 337.

which this word occurs, there is nothing which plainly requires us to lose sight of this sense; in all the places, in which the administration of the rite is mentioned, there is nothing which requires us to depart from this sense; in certain passages, the sacred writer has connected the mention of baptism with such a descriptive word, and has connected such instruction with baptism, as to show that this proper, ordinary meaning of the word was present to his mind. What conclusion now ought we to draw? If the mode of the Christian ordinance, *as represented in the New Testament*, be not determined, on what *mere philological* conclusion can we, without hesitation, depend? May I not say, let not the apostolic practice, as to baptism, considered as a mere *philological* question, that is, considered merely with reference to the language employed, be treated as "without form and void." If it must be regarded as an undefined thing, subject to the prejudice, the convenience, the caprice of any one and every one, let this view be exhibited; not as furnished by philology, but as proceeding from an entirely different source, and resting on considerations aside from the usage of language.

I forbear to make any comment on the somewhat severe remark, with which Prof. Stuart closes this part of his article; namely, that, if any one maintains a conclusion contrary to that which he has expressed, he "can hardly suppress the conviction," that "it must be either because he is unable rightly to estimate the nature or power of the Greek language; or because he is influenced in some measure by party-feeling; or else because he has looked at the subject in only a partial manner, without examining it fully and thoroughly." *

* P. 337.

§ 3. *Jewish Proselyte-Baptism.*

It has been customary with Pedobaptist writers, to connect the subject of Jewish proselyte-baptism with the subject of Christian baptism. It came to be a practice among the Jews (though not required by the laws of Moses), that when a Gentile fully embraced their religion, besides being circumcised, he immersed himself; a ceremony deemed necessary for complete purification. As the ceremony, here named, was confessedly an immersion of the whole person, and might thus be considered as strengthening the argument for immersion as essential to Christian baptism, Prof. Stuart discusses anew, as his *third* particular inquiry, the long agitated question, whether Jewish proselyte-baptism was practised before the time of John the Baptist, or whether it commenced after his time. Whatever may be the fact, as to the time when Jewish proselyte-baptism was introduced, that is, whether it was introduced *before* the time of John the Baptist, or shortly *after*, its bearing on the question now under discussion is the same. For if it commenced *previously* to the time of John, it would, as being confessedly immersion, be altogether favorable to the belief that such too was the manner of John and of the apostles. And if it commenced not long *after* the time of John, and was adopted by the Rabbins in imitation of his baptism, as Dr. Owen and Carpzov believed, and as Prof. Stuart thinks is not improbable,* still it would, as being confessedly immersion, be favorable to the same belief. It is, then, of no importance so far as the present subject is concerned, in what manner the question, as to the date of Jewish proselyte-baptism, is determined.

---

* P. 354.

After a protracted discussion Prof. Stuart concludes, "that we have sufficient evidence of the fact, that *such baptism was practised at, or not long after, the time when the second temple was destroyed.*" *

The origin of proselyte-baptism among the Jews is involved in much darkness. Probability on this topic—it may be a high degree of probability—is all we can hope to attain. If historical evidence carries us back as far as the time when the second temple was destroyed, A. D. 70, and there fails us, yet the circumstances of the Jewish nation would render it unlikely, that the rite had been recently adopted. The opinion, "that the Rabbins introduced proselyte-baptism in imitation of the popular baptism of John," † is liable to objection; the Jews would hardly adopt a distinguishing rite of a teacher, or a sect, towards whom they bore ill will.

"The learned controversies respecting Jewish proselyte-baptism have been ably examined by the late Dr. E. G. Bengel, Professor and Superintendent of the Theological Seminary at Tubingen; and it is probable, that the middle course which he has adopted, will commend itself, for the most part, to the approbation of the candid and intelligent. He says, 'Only we may suppose this as probable, that it [proselyte-baptism] first came into use gradually, when men had generally begun to increase the religious ceremonies prescribed in the Mosaic law by many traditional additions; therefore in the period after the return of the nation from the Babylonish exile; that accordingly it may be considered so far a Pharisaical addition, as the adding of new observances to what was prescribed in the written law, belongs especially to the character of the Pharisees:

* P. 352. † P. 354.

although *this* addition, perhaps, may have been introduced before a Pharisean sect had become so formed as to be opposed to other parties .... *It was reckoned in the same class with all those other lustrations to which they were accustomed* ..... It was not regarded as a *principal thing*, nor as an essentially necessary part of proselyte consecration ..... But the entirely changed condition to which the Jews found themselves reduced by the overthrow of their state and of their temple,' (A. D. 70) 'led at length, as it seems, to new and finally more fixed decrees and regulations on this subject.' See his Examination Ueber das Alter der Judischen Proselyten taufe. p. 115." *

If this account of Jewish proselyte-baptism, as existing previously to the time of John, be said to favor the opinion that John drew his baptism from an existing practice among the Jews, and thus to oppose the Saviour's implication, that the baptism of John was from heaven, Matt. 21 : 24—27; the answer is easy. John did not practise baptism, *as* Jewish proselyte-baptism, or *as a species* of that baptism; he was understood as administering this rite on very different principles and for very different purposes from those, to which the Jews had reference. He baptized the *Jews* themselves, in connection with their professed repentance, and with reference to the Messiah, and was thus forming, from among the Jews, a sort of new religious community. What though as to the *mere fact of immersion*, his practice corresponded to what they had previously seen? There were so many points of difference between his baptism and that with which they had been

* Prof. Chase's sermon on the Design of Baptism; Appendix, Note A.

acquainted, that they would be in no danger of regarding it as a continuation, or as a mere modification, of their baptism; nor would they necessarily regard him as drawing his idea of baptism from what the Rabbins had countenanced or enjoined. His baptism was by a special divine appointment, and might be so accounted, though in one respect it corresponded to theirs, which could boast no better origin than as being a superstitious appendage to the Mosaic law.

It may also be objected, that the existence of proselyte-baptism before the time of John is inconsistent with the question, put to him by the messengers whom the Pharisees sent, as recorded in John 1 : 25, "Why baptizest thou, then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?"* But, it may be asked in reply, what was more natural, than that when the rulers saw a man of distinguished holiness, thus baptizing Jews, and forming a sort of religious community out of the nation which regarded itself as a holy people, what was more natural, than that they should suspect he was either the Messiah himself, or one specially commissioned as his servant? They had a right to expect, that when the Messiah should appear, he would institute new laws, and in various ways assert his own authority. What these new laws would be, and what would be the ways in which he would assert his authority, had not been revealed to them. Here was a man establishing new practices with reference to the Jews themselves, and very extensively influencing the people; a man too, whom they could not but reverence for the sanctity of his life. *Why* BAPTIZEST *thou then, if thou be not the Christ, nor Elias, nor that prophet*, would be a very natural inquiry, even though

* P. 353.

proselyte-baptism had been practised, and even though they had never before thought that the Messiah, when he should appear, would baptize his disciples.

That they had so definite notions about the Messiah's office, as to think beforehand that he would institute the ordinance of baptism, remains to be shown. That the passages mentioned by Prof. Stuart,* Isa. 12 : 3. 44 : 3. Ezek. 36 : 25. Zech. 13 : 1, as those from which the Jews might have formed such an opinion, give no just foundation for such an opinion, a bare inspection of them is enough to show. So far then, as probability and the earliest notices of baptism in the New Testament are concerned, I see no valid objection to the supposition that Jewish proselyte-baptism was practised before the time of John the Baptist; only, if it did exist, it must be regarded as an unwarranted, superstitious addition to the Mosaic statutes.

I know what use has been made by Pedobaptist writers, of the possible, or probable, or as they have often regarded it, certain fact that proselyte-baptism was performed among the Jews before the Christian era; namely, that it has been used as a starting point in the defence of infant baptism. And I know that some Baptist writers, as well as some distinguished Pedobaptists, have denied the early practice of proselyte-baptism among the Jews. But neither of these things ought to blind us to the light of evidence or of probability; and still further, if any Christians choose thus intimately to connect their proof of what they practise as a divine ordinance with the superstitious practices of the Jews, practices, too, the antiquity of which is so much a matter

* P. 354.

of disputation, on themselves be the responsibility of deserting the plain, beaten path of Holy Scripture.

§ 4. "*Mode of Baptism in the early Christian Churches.*"

"We come now to inquire, *What was the mode of Baptism practised by the churches in the early ages of Christianity, and* AFTER *the times of the Apostles.*"

That it was immersion, Prof. Stuart renders clear by a sufficient number of extracts from early writers. These extracts are made from the Pastor of Hermas, one of the earliest uninspired remains after the times of the apostles, from Justin Martyr, who flourished in the second century, Tertullian who died A. D. 220, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Dionysius Areopagita, Gregory Nyssen, Damascenus, and several others. After exhibiting these testimonies, he thus proceeds: "But enough. 'It is,' says Augusti (Denkw. VII. p. 216), 'a thing made out,' viz. the ancient practice of immersion. So indeed all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject, conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient times, which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject, to deny this."*

There is also presented another extract from the same work of Augusti, in which is stated the result to which F. Brenner, a Roman Catholic writer, came in view of historical facts; namely, "Thirteen hundred years was baptism generally and ordinarily performed by the immersion of a man under water; and only in extraordinary cases, was sprinkling or affusion permitted. These

* P. 359.

latter methods of baptism were called in question, and even prohibited."*

Again; "In the work of John Floyer on Cold Bathing, p. 50, it is mentioned, that the English church practised *immersion* down to the beginning of the seventeenth century; when a change to the method of sprinkling gradually took place. As a confirmation of this, it may be mentioned, that the first Liturgy in 1547 enjoins a *trine immersion*, in case the child is not sickly: Augusti, ut supra, p. 229."*

The oriental church, too, that is, the Greek church, it is mentioned, has always continued to preserve immersion "even down to the present time."†

That such was the practice in the early churches, Prof. Stuart considers as decided also by the fact, that during a certain period, persons in order to be baptized were divested of all their garments and were baptized in a state of complete nakedness;‡ a practice, not to be traced, of course, to the New Testament, and not mentioned by the earliest writers, but originating, with many other perversions and corruptions, in ignorance, or superstition, or some strange waywardness which would not be content with an adherence to the simple guidance of God's word. To this same prolific source, doubtless, must *trine* immersion be traced; that is, the immersing of the candidate three times.

From this general practice, "there were cases of exception allowed, now and then." "Persons in extreme sickness or danger were allowed baptism by affusion;"§ for at a very early period, baptism came to be regarded as essential to salvation, so that it was considered unsafe to go into eternity without it. "But all such cases

* P. 361. † P. 360. ‡ P. 359. § P. 359

were manifestly regarded as exceptions to the common usage of the church."*

There is a remark made by Prof. Stuart in this connection, which requires a slight notice. Augustine is quoted as saying, "After you professed your belief, three times did we *submerge* (demersimus) your heads in the sacred fountain." It is then added, "Was it the head only? Or did he mean to include with it the whole body? Every now and then passages of this nature occur, which lead one to suspect that *total* immersion was not uniform in the early church." † That Augustine did not mean the head only, but included with it the whole body, few, I presume, can feel themselves entitled to doubt. Should there be any doubt, it would entirely depart after reading, on the same page on which Augustine is quoted, an extract from Chrysostom: "We, as in a sepulchre, *immersing* (καταδύοντων) our heads in water, the old man is buried, and *sinking down* (καταδὺς κάτω), the *whole* is concealed at once; then as we emerge, the new man again rises."

"In what manner, then," Prof. Stuart asks, "did the churches of Christ from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word βαπτίζω [baptizo], in the New Testament? Plainly, they construed it as meaning *immersion*. They sometimes even went so far as to forbid any other method of administering the ordinance, cases of necessity and mercy only excepted." ‡ "We are left in no doubt," he continues, "as to the more generally received usage of the Christian Church, down to a period several centuries after the apostolic age." ‡ And, "that the Greek fathers, and the Latin ones who were familiar with the Greek [language], understood the usual

* P. 359. † P 358. ‡ P. 362.

import of the word *βαπτίζω*, would hardly seem to be capable of a denial." *

This topic closes by mentioning the manner in which the ancient Syriac version of the New Testament, called the Peshito, translates the word *βαπτίζω*. The Peshito is the oldest, and is "one of the most faithful and authentic of all the ancient versions" of the New Testament. In this version, *βαπτίζω* is translated by a word which, in the opinion of Prof. Stuart, appears to express the idea, *to stand, to confirm, to establish;* while yet the Syriac language has a word which signifies *to plunge, to immerse*. The conclusion which he thinks almost inevitable from this is, that the Syriac "translator did not deem it important to designate any particular" manner of the baptismal rite; but that "baptism, in the language of the Peshito, is simply *the rite of confirmation*, while the manner of this is apparently left without being at all expressed." †

In regard to this usage of the Syriac translation, I have two remarks to make, which may, at least, show, that we are not authorized to draw from it an opinion unfavorable to the conclusion, which the original language of the New Testament leads us to adopt. 1. In all languages, there are anomalies in the meanings of some words, of which no satisfactory account can be given. 2. This same Syriac word is employed in passages, in which, beyond all doubt, the idea of *overwhelming* is expressed; namely, Luke 12 : 50. Mark 10 : 38, 39.

It may be a satisfaction to the reader, if I add the remark which Michaelis, in his edition of Castel's Syriac Lexicon, has made respecting this word. After ascrib-

* P. 362. † P. 363.

ing to it the meaning, *ablutus est*, *baptizatus est*, he directs the reader to the following note: "In this signification of baptizing, not a few compare [the word] with the Hebrew עָמַד *he stood;* so that, *to stand* may be *to stand in the river, and in it to be immersed.* To me," he proceeds, "it seems more probable, that it is plainly different from עָמַד, and that by some change of letters it originated from" [an Arabic word which may be expressed by the following Hebrew letters, עטמ, and which signifies] "*to submerge, to immerse.**

§ 5. "*Importance of the Mode of Baptism.*"

So far as philology and history are concerned, this discussion might probably be here terminated. I trust it is now plain, that no unexceptionable reason has been adduced for departing from the appropriate meaning of *βαπτίζω* [baptizo], when it is used in reference to the Christian ordinance. But however plain this matter may be, when viewed simply in the light of philology and of history, *are Christians now bound to preserve the original rite?*

To this point Prof. Stuart next leads us, as "our main question." The question is thus stated, "*Is any particular mode of applying water in Baptism, essential to the performance of this rite?*" †

---

* In hac baptizandi significatione conferunt haud pauci cum Hebraico עָמַד *stetit*, ita ut, *stare* sit *stare in flumine, illoque mergi.* Mihi verisimilius, diversum plane ab עָמַד, literarumque aliqua permutatione ortum ex ﻉ ﻁ ﻡ [עטמ] *submergere.*" Under the word ﻉ ﻁ ﻡ.

To make this matter plainer, I observe that this Syriac word, which may be thus expressed in Hebrew letters, עטמ, is derived by Michaelis not from the Hebrew word עמד *he stood*, but from the Arabic עטם *he immersed.*

† P. 363.

He here introduces a quotation from Calvin, in respect to which he says, "To this opinion I do most fully and heartily subscribe." The quotation is this; "It is of no consequence at all, whether the person baptized is totally immersed, or whether he is merely sprinkled by an affusion of water. This should be a matter of choice to the churches in different regions; although the word *baptize* signifies *to immerse*, and the rite of immersion was practised by the ancient church." *

This sentence contains the principle on which much of the remaining part of the article is founded; but this sentence, in itself considered, labors under the difficulty of assuming the very point at issue. It proceeds on the principle that, while immersion is indeed baptism, affusion, or sprinkling, may also be baptism. In other words, it assumes that immersion is only a mode of baptism, and that affusion, or sprinkling, is also a mode of baptism. But the very point at issue is, whether any thing besides immersion is baptism, and consequently whether immersion ought to be regarded merely as a mode of baptism, or as baptism itself; so that where there is not immersion, there is not baptism. If indeed the Christian ordinance be, not immersion only, but either immersion, or pouring, or sprinkling, or washing, or any application of water whatever, then is Calvin's remark correct. But it has not yet been satisfactorily shown, that pouring, or sprinkling, or any thing besides immersion, is baptism.

To the vindication of the sentiment thus advanced by Calvin, Prof. Stuart directs his efforts, not of course on philological grounds. And throughout his defence, there seems to prevail the same assumption as is noticed above

* P. 364.

in Calvin's remark. He defends it by three considerations. 1. "The rite in question is *merely external.*" 2. "No injunction is any where given in the New Testament, respecting the manner in which this rite shall be performed." 3. "Personal safety and convenience often demand that immersion should be dispensed with."*

1. On the first of these reasons, I observe, that though baptism is an external rite, and though an external rite is not essential to the Christian religion, yet immersion may be essential to the *rite* itself, and to the conveying of the instruction which it is intended to communicate. It may not, then, be lawful to substitute something else in the place of that which has been instituted. It may, also, be far more important than at first appears, to adhere strictly to the performance of the act which the institutor of the rite established. Errors in religion frequently enter by slow and imperceptible degrees; and wrong views and wrong practices concerning the ordinances of the gospel, have been not the least fruitful sources of delusion and destruction. The history of baptism affords abundant evidence of this, and reads us a very impressive lesson on the danger of departing from the path which our Lord has marked out. Had there been a strict and a simple adherence to what the Lord appointed, we never should have heard of unction as an appendage to baptism; or of trine immersion; or of its being required, that persons, when complying with this rite, should be divested of their apparel; to say nothing of the fatal delusion, which arose from the supposed saving efficacy of baptism.

2. In regard to the second reason; namely, "no in-

* Pp. 364, 365. 378.

junction is any where given in the New Testament, respecting the manner in which this rite shall be performed;" there is no need of such an injunction as is here contemplated. For, (to use language which Prof. Stuart represents another as employing), "the manner of the rite is involved in the word itself which is used to designate it."*

Prof. Stuart endeavors to destroy the force of this reply, by saying that it would prove too much. This he attempts to illustrate by what he calls a case "of a parallel nature.... the Lord's Supper. The original institution of this rite took place at the last passover which Jesus and his disciples celebrated in Jerusalem. They were assembled in an upper room; Luke 22 : 12. They reclined upon the usual sofa or triclinium, on which the ancients reposed at their meals; John 13 : 23, 25. It was night when they kept the feast, John 13 : 30. They kept it with unleavened bread, for no other was found in the houses of the Jews, at the feast of the passover, Ex. 12 : 19. The wine which they drank was that of Palestine, probably red wine. It was kept in leathern bottles, it was served in peculiar vessels. The bread was made in a certain particular fashion. The clothes of the guests were of a certain form. In a word, all the circumstances of the occasion were, in some respect or other, different from those which now accompany the administration of the Lord's Supper. Yet Jesus gave command respecting this ordinance in the following manner: THIS DO, *in remembrance of me;* Luke 22 : 19, 20. 1 Cor. 11 : 24, 25."

"I ask now," continues Prof. Stuart, "all the advocates for the *literal* sense of *βαπτίζω*, who urge upon the

* P. 365.

churches the original *mode* of this rite [baptism], why they do not urge upon them in the same manner and for the same reason, the literal doing of what Christ commanded as to the sacrament ?"*

However convincing this may appear to some, I apprehend there is some looseness in the reasoning. This representation does not furnish a parallel case. Several circumstances are here mentioned which attended the institution of the Lord's Supper. But the question about baptism has no respect to the *circumstances* attending it. It has respect to the *thing itself*. Now Jesus gave no precepts about the circumstances of baptism ; and he gave none about the circumstances of the Lord's Supper. He commanded to baptize ; this command ought to be obeyed. He commanded to partake of bread and wine in remembrance of him ; this command ought to be obeyed. Let any one examine Luke 22 : 19, 20, and ask, what did the Lord mean when he said, THIS DO? Every mind at once replies, that he said nothing, and that he meant nothing, about preserving wine in leathern bottles, about reclining on a triclinium, &c. He enjoined upon his disciples, to eat bread and to drink wine in remembrance of him. But should any persons do something else with the bread and wine, than to eat and drink, or should they employ other substances, or should they employ these, yet not in remembrance of Christ, there would be a departure from his command.

So in regard to baptism. The Lord has commanded to baptize ; but he has given no command about the circumstances of time, and place, and dress, and posture, and accompanying prayers and praises. These are

* Pp. 365, 366.

circumstances which affect not the command itself. The two cases, then, as presented by Prof. Stuart, are by no means parallel: one regards the *thing* itself; the other, solely the *circumstances* of the thing.

A parallel case would be, a departure from the thing commanded in each ordinance. What is the thing commanded in each? We are required to be baptized; and we are required to partake of bread and of wine. Now if a person declines to be baptized, and contents himself with some uncommanded ceremony that had been performed upon him in infancy or at any age, and that does not answer to the design of baptism, can he compare his failure to the conduct of a person who does partake of bread and wine out of regard to the Lord's authority? What though he does partake of these emblems in circumstances widely different from those, in which the ordinance was at first established and commanded? The Lord gave not even a shadow of a command respecting these circumstances; and these circumstances communicate no part of the moral instruction to be conveyed.

It is not right, then, to represent a Baptist as saying in regard to the Lord's Supper, "I obey the substantial part of the command, viz. to partake of bread and wine in grateful remembrance of Christ; and this is all which the nature of the case seems to require."* This is not only the *substantial part* of the command; it is so far as the language can be understood, the *command itself*, the *whole* of the command. And to represent these accompanying circumstances as *at all* entering into the Saviour's original command, and to represent as parallel the ACTION, whatever it be, expressed by the word *bap-*

* P. 366.

tize, and the CIRCUMSTANCES in which another action was commanded, really pours no *light* on the matter under discussion.

These *circumstances* in regard to the Lord's Supper, are properly parallel to *circumstances* in regard to baptism; namely, its being administered in the day, or in the night; in the Jordan, or in any other river; in a pond or a baptistery; and a baptistery either under cover, or in the open air; its being administered to persons kneeling, or standing; the candidate's being placed under the water with his head bowing forwards, or in an opposite direction.

These circumstances affect not the rite itself; nor do the mere circumstances which accompany the Lord's Supper affect that rite. Let it be *proved* that immersion is only a circumstance of baptism, and the reasoning which I have now exposed would hold good; but let it not be taken *for granted*, that immersion is a mere circumstance of the command to baptize.

A change of the elements appointed for the Lord's Supper is mentioned above, as a departure from the Saviour's command. The intimation, made by Prof. Stuart, that a truly spiritual mind would judge differently,* and would not be strenuous in regard to external observances, needs to be carefully considered before it is acted on. If this be so, what may not a *spiritual* mind do in regard to religious observances? and what may it not neglect? and what alterations may it not introduce? The religion which our omniscient Creator has established, is adapted for just such beings as men are; beings, capable of deriving great profit from a few simple symbols, and needing such symbols as, in their

* P. 367.

very nature, are suited to convey the instruction which the Saviour intended. He knew what particular rites are most appropriate; and the ministers of religion best show their regard for the authority of the Head of the church, and for the moral welfare of men, if not their spirituality, by a careful compliance with what divine authority has established. If providential circumstances render it impracticable for a person to attend upon certain religious observances, his obligation to attend upon them ceases for the time being; nor is he called upon, under the show of obedience, to substitute something else in their place. The Lord chooses mercy, and not sacrifice. And, in my apprehension, he shows a more truly spiritual mind, who feels himself exempted from obligation, because divine providence has put insuperable obstacles in his way; than he who feels that, though he cannot strictly obey the command, he yet must do something, and therefore substitutes an unrequired service, a mere 'bodily exercise' which certainly 'profiteth but little.' In the latter case, there seems to be at least a remnant of servile, self-righteous attachment to outward performances. But if something be thus substituted, let it be called by its right name, *a substitute* for what has been appointed; and let not a person, because he may possess a spiritual mind, feel himself at liberty to establish what the Lord has not required, or to alter, at his own will, what the Lord has required. The history of religious ordinances, and of religion, as affected by those ordinances, is of so sombre a character that we ought carefully to guard against departures from divine appointment, even though a spiritual mind might suggest the departures.

In regard to the particular case supposed by Prof. Stuart, and mentioned by him as one about the propriety

of which no doubt ought to be felt, namely, the Icelanders', during a year of great distress, employing fish and water,* instead of bread and wine, in a professed celebration of the Lord's Supper, I doubt not that I express the spontaneous feeling of many truly spiritual Christians, by saying, the mind instinctively, as it were, turns away from such a representation. There ought to be no surprise, if *such* a celebration should be regarded in almost any other light, than in that of a profitable religious ordinance. At best it could be called only a substitute. Besides, what may be expedient in a case of uncommon exigency, furnishes no rule for guidance in ordinary circumstances. The Lord, too, may accept the sincere desires and the pious emotions which may accompany erroneous practices, while yet he may regard the practices, as they really are, erroneous, and in many instances leading, sooner or later, to dangerous results.

But why so strict? Because the ordinances of the gospel are full of meaning; and acts, differing from those primitive ordinances, do not convey all the intended meaning. In respect to baptism, moral purification is indeed a part of the meaning which it was intended to express; the proof of this is, in my judgment, and as is well shown by Prof. Stuart, abundant in the word of God. I see not how any, as Prof. Stuart intimates that some do,† can believe baptism to be "*merely* a type or emblem of the *death* of Christ;" or the "two rites under the new dispensation" to be "both significant of only one and the same thing." Indeed, I never knew any who thus taught respecting the ordinance of baptism.

---

* P. 367. † P. 370.

It is most readily granted, that if purification be the *only* thing represented by baptism, then there is by no means so much need of opposing a departure from immersion. But something else is also intended to be represented, which renders immersion necessary; and as the purification represented in baptism, is purification obtained through the death and resurrection of Christ, it is surely not surprising that the apostle should teach, that in baptism there is a recognition of this death and resurrection, and of our obligation to die unto sin, as Christ died for sin; and to rise to a new and holy life, as Christ arose to a new and glorious life.

Conceding, then, that sprinkling, or pouring, or washing may have a significancy, it does not follow that it has all the significancy, which the baptismal rite was intended to possess. Let the rite be so performed, as to convey all the moral instruction which it was intended to convey. The rite has no "mystical power of itself to sanctify;—it is a symbolical rite, significant of truth, i. e. of doctrine, or fact."* None of its significancy ought to be lost; but in all its fullness, and all its appropriateness, it ought to be observed, and made a source of salutary and heart-affecting instruction to its recipients.

Immersion may indeed be practised without its real meaning's being always perceived and felt; and without the life and power of religion, either in its administrators or in its subjects. But what then? Does this argue, that a regard to immersion is either injurious, or even useless, to piety? Of what religious observance, and of the belief of what religious doctrine, may not as much be said? Does the case of the Oriental church, mentioned by Prof. Stuart as "the most vicious and ignorant

---

* P. 376.

of all who bear the name of Christians"—"*twice dead* and" deserving "to be plucked up by the roots," * does the case of this church, which is zealously attached to immersion, prove the uselessness of adhering to the primitive rite? The causes of moral death in the Oriental church, that is among the modern Greeks, can be found elsewhere than in this matter. And who can doubt that that portion of Christendom would now have been in a far different state, if the ordinances, as Christ appointed them, had been strictly observed, and if no human additions and modifications had been appended to the simplicity that is in Christ?

On the ground exhibited above, I acknowledge I do not feel at liberty to substitute any human device for what the Head of the church has established. But while, on this ground, I feel myself thus restricted, I do not regard it as a just consequence, that I am "not at liberty, without being justly exposed to the accusation of gross departure from Christianity, to depart from the *modes* and *forms* of the apostolic church in any respect." Nor do I see the propriety of the following questions proposed by Prof. Stuart: "I ask those who plead for literal conformity in mode to the ancient rite of baptism, how they dispose of the ordinance respecting the disciples' washing each other's feet, described at large in John, c. XII. and particularly enjoined in vs. 14, 15? Who has repealed the obligation to a literal conformity with this command? You will say, It is the *spirit*, rather than the letter, which is here inculcated. I accede. But what is the case in respect to baptism? Will nothing but the *letter* do here? So you may think and reason; but are you not entirely inconsistent with yourself?"*

* P. 377.

No; I reply. If our Lord did indeed enjoin this as an ordinance of his religion, to be perpetually observed, we ought not to neglect it. But did he enjoin this act as a standing observance of religion; an ordinance, as really as that of baptism and that of the Lord's Supper? Or was this act of the Saviour solely and altogether intended to show the disciples the spirit which they should cherish, and to enjoin upon them a certain class of social and relative duties, without enjoining any one external act at all? Does not the subsequent history of the apostles show this? We violate no ordinance of our Lord, by not washing one another's feet; we disobey no precept of his, by not washing one another's feet, provided we cherish the humility and the benevolence which he thus impressively inculcated. Not so in the injunction respecting baptism. There was *an external act* enjoined, a certain religious observance. And though a person should mortify his sinful propensities and preserve in his breast a remembrance of his crucified and risen Lord, but yet comply not with the enjoined observance of baptism and of the Lord's Supper, he would be living in disobedience to his Master. The two cases, then, are not parallel.

Just so with the instructions by Paul to the Corinthians respecting dress and hair,† produced by Prof. Stuart as illustrating our liberty to depart from the apostolic practice of immersion; and just so, it may be added, with the instructions to them respecting living in an unmarried state. If it can be shown, that these instructions were not, most manifestly, intended as local and temporary, but were evidently intended to point out duties universally binding, we should be under obli-

* P. 372. † P. 372.

gations to comply with them. If the apostle's instructions were urged upon these followers of the Saviour, *as being the Saviour's followers*, and consequently applicable at all times, and in all places, then all the followers of Christ, *as such*, ought to obey them. But if they were addressed to *Corinthian* followers of Christ, *as being inhabitants of Corinth, at such a time, and in such and such circumstances*, then they plainly, as precepts, make no claim upon our observance. But can baptism be spoken of in this manner—baptism, a public religious ordinance of universal and perpetual obligation? Can any one feel the same liberty in regard to baptism, that he may justly feel in regard to the apostle's instructions to the Corinthians on topics of local and temporary interest? The cases are not parallel.

It is asked, "Why should baptism be made symbolical of the *death* of Christ? All Jewish analogy is against it:"* inasmuch as all the ablutions of the ritual law were designed to signify *purification*. This remark might be of force against one who should deny that purification is signified by baptism. But while purification, confessedly, is signified, Jewish analogy is of no weight at all against the additional Christian significancy which is derived from the *manner* of employing the purifying element; namely, a burial in it, and an arising out of it, signifying our conformity to Christ in death to sin and rising to a new life. Jewish analogy touches not at all this additional significancy, nor are we at liberty to reject this additional significancy as being in our opinion needless, unless we can satisfactorily show, that the apostle did not thus represent baptism. It is on his teaching, that the *manner* of the baptismal rite is regarded as significant.

---

* P. 268.

That some churches began, at an early period, to depart from apostolic usage, is indeed matter of history. The language of Cyprian (A. D. 240) quoted by Prof. Stuart is sufficient evidence of this; as are the proofs produced by him from subsequent ages.* This departure, however, may be traced to principles quite different from those which are now pleaded as justifying it. At a very early period, superstitious notions were cherished respecting the efficacy of baptism; and as it was conceived to hold an indispensable connection with salvation, it was of course deemed desirable that its benefits should be extensively enjoyed, and that none should pass into eternity without its salutary influence. Hence, for persons on sick beds, who had not been baptized, the semblance of baptism at least was sought, through the belief that, though there was some deficiency in the performance, yet, in the circumstances of the persons, the saving benefit of the ordinance would not be withheld. It was not then, in general, *spirituality*, it was not correct views of the gospel, that led to the change in the performance. It was superstition in regard to the ordinance. And as we know how grossly incorrect were the views of the churches respecting the value of external rites, it is not at all surprising, that during the dark ages and at an earlier period, there are many proofs of departure from the primitive practice. These instances of departure, however, are exceptions to the general practice; exceptions, which owe their origin to superstitious notions concerning the efficacy of baptism, and to a regard for convenience, and which therefore are but poorly adapted to be precedents for our guidance or encouragement.

---

* P. 373—375.

3. As to the third allegation, that "personal safety and convenience often demand that immersion should be dispensed with;" it probably needs only a slight notice.

The difficulties supposed to be connected with the ancient rite are only imaginary; and are of little power except in the hands of an adversary, to excite dread and disesteem against the ordinance. Among those who always practise immersion, the mention of such difficulties only provokes a smile; and it serves to show how empty is mere theory, when contrasted with facts.

Shall I be told that men have actually, by their practice of immersion, contracted disorders and met with accidents which have terminated in death? May I not also ask, did never a minister die in the pulpit? Did never a man come to his dissolution, when on an errand of mercy? We have no right to expect that God will work miracles to prevent the natural effects of presumption or of imprudence, even though committed in respect to the cause of Christ.

But why enlarge on so plain a case? Whatever baptism be (and I extend the remark to all outward religious observances), when divine providence renders the administration of the ordinance impracticable, a truly spiritual mind will experience no distressing apprehensions of the displeasure of God for not observing the ordinance. "God is a spirit," and requires the heart; and when access to water is "dangerous or impossible," such a mind will conclude, that persons need not, for the present, be baptized. For, as Prof. Stuart says, "no external ordinance is obligatory when it becomes dangerous to health or life."* Baptism has no

* P. 380.

inherent "power of itself to sanctify." "It was not instituted to injure, destroy, or even hazard life."* But while a person, possessing a truly spiritual mind, will thus conclude, he will not feel it necessary to substitute something in the place of what has been commanded, as though some external observances must, at all events, be performed. True spirituality will rest in the conclusion, that *if there be a willing mind, it is accepted according to what a man hath;* and that he does well, that *it is in his heart* to render obedience. Yet let circumstances change, let obstacles be removed, and let there be an opportunity for complying with an enjoined external duty, and even his spirituality would prompt him to embrace the opportunity; and should he not embrace the opportunity, his spirituality could not long be enjoyed, and conscience would loudly accuse him of disobedience.

The intimation that the use of baptisteries, as a method of surmounting, or avoiding, great inconveniences, is inconsistent with *literal* obedience to the command respecting baptism, is quite unfounded. Jesus has enjoined baptism upon believers; but he has given no injunction about the place, and other circumstances. The religious immersion of a believer in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is baptism, whether administered in a river, or a lake, formed by the Creator; or in a canal, or a body of water, which owes its present form and location to human contrivance. And what matters it, as to the fact of baptism, and as to the moral instruction conveyed by it, whether this body of water be in the open air, or be under a roof? There is no departure from the original

* P. 350.

command; there is no want of literal conformity to the original command; for the original command touches none of these circumstances.

Nor, on this same ground, is it warrantable to throw out the intimation, that consistency would require of the advocates of immersion, that persons about to be baptized should be "*naked as Adam and Eve before their fall.*"* (I use here the very words of Prof. Stuart; and I scarcely know how to express my sorrow, that he should urge a thought which is so needless, and so uncalled for, and which is certainly more fitted, though, I fully believe, not intended, for exciting disesteem against his fellow Christians, than for sober argumentation.) Does this circumstance enter at all into the command? Is this circumstance at all required by any scriptural statements concerning the significancy of baptism? By no means. Prof. Stuart, though he urges this topic, merely says, "if you take your stand on the ancient practice of the churches in the days of the early Christian fathers .... I have the like charge [i. e. charge of "a grievous departure from the command of Christ"] "to make against you."† But who ever charged any Christians with "departure from the command of Christ," on the ground that they were not conforming to "the ancient practice of the churches in the days of the early Christian fathers?" Besides, who are they that take their "stand on the ancient practice of the churches in the days of the early Christian fathers?" Surely not those who refuse to sprinkling the name of baptism. They ask not, as a principal question, What did the early fathers teach? What did the early fathers practise? but, *What saith the Scripture?*

---

* P. 381. † P. 381.

Nor is there just ground for the remark by Prof. Stuart that "there is the same kind of evidence," that the primitive mode of baptism requires persons to be divested of all their garments, as proves to us "that immersion was the only apostolic mode of baptism: viz. the universal usage of the ancient churches."* Suppose for a moment, that all the records of the ancient churches had been lost, and that in order to ascertain what baptism is, we were restricted to the New Testament, and to the still earlier sources of evidence respecting the meaning of words? Or suppose, (what is perpetually happening among newly converted disciples of Jesus, in their conscientious desires to know what the Lord has enjoined upon his followers,) suppose we should confine ourselves, in the investigation of our duty respecting baptism, to the word of God. Need we, in such circumstances be in doubt as to what we ought to do? In the word of God, we have sufficient evidence, that immersion was the apostolic baptism; while there is no satisfactory evidence, that any thing else was practised as baptism, and no satisfactory evidence that the word *βαπτίζω* [*baptize*] ever loses sight of its meaning, *to immerse*. Can such a remark be made respecting *being divested of garments* at baptism? Can *being divested of garments* be sustained by "the same kind of evidence," as the duty of immersion can? If indeed it were "the universal usage of the ancient churches," by which the duty of immersion is proved, and if *on that ground* any persons practised it, they might perhaps be incumbered in their reasoning by the unworthy practice above referred to, and by many other practices attached by human device to the simple injunctions of Christ. But it can-

* P. 382.

not be shown that such was "the universal usage of the" most "ancient churches;" it was rather an innovation upon the most ancient practice. No intimation exists in the New Testament of such a practice, nor in the earliest Christian fathers.

It is not, however, the advocates of immersion, on whom such consequences, drawn from acting on *such a ground*, ought to be fastened. It ought to be more generally known, and it ought to be most seriously and solemnly considered, that it is the advocates of *infant* sprinkling, who have exposed themselves to the more just charge of being incumbered with such consequences. That practice, which they defend as a Christian ordinance, is a ceremony which has not a proper warrant in the Bible, which is not defensible by just Scriptural argument; and the proof for which must be made out "*in another way*" than by the directions, and examples, and plain intimations of Scripture. And whether such a method of determining Christian duty be not incumbered with the consequence, that "there is the same kind of evidence" for certain other unscriptural ceremonies as there is for the sprinkling of infants, let consistency testify, let the defences of Roman Catholic errors testify.

It is true, that in discussions respecting baptism, use is made of the fact, that the most ancient churches after the times of the apostles practised immersion; but it is rather in the light of confirmation, than of direct proof, of our present duty. The practice of those ancient Christians in this respect, coincided with what, from other sources, we learn to be the meaning of the word which expresses the ordinance, and the practice of the apostles; nor can their practice be well accounted for in any other way, than by their perceiving the real

meaning of the word βαπτίζω [*baptize*], and by the fact that the practice of immersion descended to them from the times of the New Testament.

But is not this representation stripped, in part at least, of its force, by the objection, that although "the classical use of the word abundantly justifies the construction I put upon it;" yet "classical usage can never be very certain in respect to the meaning of a word in the New Testament?" Such is the objection made by Prof. Stuart.* But certainly this broad statement needs qualifying. If a word used by the classics be of such a kind as not to be affected by Jewish idiom, its classical meaning may hold good even in the New Testament. Again, if a word used by the classics be of such a kind, as not to be affected by the different and superior religious information and opinions of the Jews, its classical meaning may remain in the New Testament. Now the words *God*, *heaven*, *flesh*, *faith*, *righteousness*, mentioned by Prof. Stuart, and many other words, must necessarily have different meanings, or different shades of meaning, in the New Testament from those which they have in the heathen classics, on account of the different state of religious knowledge among the Jews, and on account of the influence which the ancient language of the nation had upon their modes of expression. But not all the words which occur in the New Testament undergo a change of meaning. The words *to walk*, *stand*, *recline*, *eat*, *drink*, *sleep*, and many others, may be illustrated from classical use. Their meaning is the same in all writers; and in regard to a multitude of words, there were no peculiar modes of expression, or of thinking, which would subject a person to mistake who should

* P. 382.

pass from the reading of the classics to the reading of the New Testament. Is there then any thing in the nature of the word *immerse* or *dip*, which would require its classical meaning to be altered when the word occurs in the New Testament? Was there any thing in the religious knowledge of the Jews, that would require a departure from the classical meaning? Is there any thing in the meaning, or in the use of the Hebrew word to which *βαπτίζω* [*baptize*] corresponds, that requires its classical meaning to be deserted? The Hebrew word to which *βαπτίζω* [*baptize*] corresponds, clearly means *to dip, to immerse.* If an immersion in any case, or on any occasion, was enjoined, the *Jews* would not be likely to evade the performance of this rite through any views of the spirituality of God. Why then place this word among those, whose classical meaning will not hold in the New Testament, but which have undergone a change in meaning through the influence of the Hebrew language, or the influence of different religious institutions? If we pass from the classical use of the word to that of the Septuagint, we find no necessity for departing from classical use. If, again, we examine the word in the Apocryphal writings, no sufficient reason can be exhibited for departing from the classical use. Nor is there a satisfactory reason for abandoning this use of the word, when it occurs in the New Testament in reference to other subjects than the baptismal rite. Ought then the evidence for the meaning of this word, derived from classic use, to be disposed of in the very summary way of saying, there is a multitude of words whose New Testament meaning does not conform to their classic meaning?

I have now finished my examination, so far as the principal arguments and statements are concerned. On

the various concessions made by Prof. Stuart, I leave my readers to their own reflections. There are some miscellaneous topics, on which a few remarks will not, I trust, be deemed inappropriate.

SECTION FIFTH.

Miscellaneous Topics.

Pharisaic Righteousness.

By some parts of the article which I have been examining, an impression is made, whether intended or not, that strenuousness about retaining the original rite of baptism involves some belief of a mystical efficacy in the rite, or a leaven of Pharisaic righteousness. So far, however, as I have had opportunity to observe, ministers and Christians of the Baptist denomination are remarkably free from any such notion, especially so far as this ordinance is concerned; and to speak to them of *the efficacy of baptism*, is to use language to which they are unaccustomed, and to which they cannot attach definite ideas. This too is very easily explained. They regard baptism as intended only for those who are *already* in a state of favor with God, that is, for the truly regenerate; and as nothing, in their view, is baptism, but the immersion of professed believers, zeal in regard to this practice amounts to the same, in them, as zeal would, in others, for any divinely appointed ordinance. And as to Pharisaic righteousness, there is no more ground for such a charge against them, than there would be for a similar charge against the most humble and spiritually minded Protestant, who should vindicate, in the administration

of the Lord's Supper, the use of both bread and wine, in opposition to the Papist, who contends, that the wine must be withheld from the laity. May I be excused for hinting, not I trust, in the spirit of recrimination, that on this point, too, the practice of infant sprinkling has had a very intimate connection with unscriptural dependence on external ceremonies for securing the favor of God. How much do many persons dread that their infants should die without this ceremony! And how often have learned and venerable ministers been summoned, and how often have they hastened, to the chamber of affliction, lest, as it would seem, some little sufferer should breathe its last before *the seal of the covenant* had been placed upon it!* I would not represent this as a necessary consequence of the sprinkling of infants. Far from it. I only speak of this feeling as what has extensively prevailed in connection with this practice, and what has not yet entirely ceased; still, I trust, the feeling is now less extensively and less strongly cherished.

Language not sufficiently guarded.

In a few instances, the language of Prof. Stuart in his essay is not quite so guarded as propriety would require. In speaking of the *mode* of the baptismal rite as not being essential, the distinction is not uniformly observed between its being essential, or not, to the *rite*, and

* A venerable minister, now occupying an eminent station, has been understood to say, that of the salvation of deceased infants who had been baptized, he had no doubt, but in regard to others, though he had hope, yet he could not express so much confidence.

its being essential, or not, to *Christianity*. And indeed, in a passage or two, the language can hardly fail to convey the idea, that the principle of literal conformity to the original rite involves the sentiment, that immersion is essential to *the Christian religion*, and thus that the proper performance of this rite enters into the essentials of *piety*.* A very wrong idea, certainly; and one, which Prof. Stuart would be the last man in the world intentionally to charge upon those whose opinions he has been opposing. Immersion may be *essential to the ordinance*, so that if a person have not been immersed on a profession of his faith, he may not have complied with the Saviour's injunction; and yet immersion may *not be essential to his piety*, just as on various accounts, and in various circumstances, no external observance whatever may be essential to piety. As this, however, namely, their not being essential to piety, or salvation, is no argument against external observances in general, so neither is it an argument against the duty and the propriety of immersion in particular.

The word *ordinance*, too, employed in reference to the washing of feet† (John c. 13), is justly liable to exception. However wide may be the possible application of this word, as suggested solely by its etymology, and however variously it may actually be used on common topics, yet its religious use is very considerably restricted; and it invariably suggests to the mind, an external observance of universal and perpetual obligation upon the followers of Christ. Prof. Stuart does not, probably, use the word, when referring to the above named chapter, in this sense. If he does not, his language certainly implies a more grievous charge than he intended.

---

* Pp. 364, 365. † P. 372.

Tendency of some Leading Principles in Prof. Stuart's Essay.

I venture a remark respecting the tendency of some of the principles developed in the essay which I have been examining. They are not sufficiently safe. Why may not ministers, who favorably regard the views which it exhibits, be willing to dispense entirely with every thing that has been called baptism, and admit into their churches persons who in their own judgment and by universal opinion, are not baptized, provided those persons profess to think it needless to be baptized? And, thus what security is there for an uncompromising maintenance of *his* command, by whose authority ministers profess to act? Again; to illustrate the tendency of these principles in an opposite direction, why may not ministers and Christians, out of accommodation to existing circumstances, regard as matters of utter indifference, various appendages which have been attached to the gospel? Such appendages may not indeed be defended, or approved; but, at the same time, their removal may not be thought of sufficient importance to cost an effort. For God is a spirit; he requires the heart; these external things are mere costume.

Influence on the Philological Study of the Bible.

I feel constrained also, in sorrow of spirit, to say that the general impression, made by this article in reference to the philological study of the Bible, is unfavorable. In more minds than one has such a thought arisen. Some persons, of no little discrimination too, have thought that an important scriptural subject has been

treated by a warm advocate for such study, in a manner not conformable to just rules of interpretation. They have thought, that an intelligent infidel could not but be confirmed by this article, viewed as a whole, in his hostility against the Bible, as a book explained by its friends, not on just and rational principles, but according to their own purposes.

A use, not justified by sacred philology and correct rules of interpretation, has been made of a passage, which I know is a favorite one with many, particularly the uninformed, in their defence of sprinkling; viz. Ezek. 36: 25, *Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you.* Concerning this text, the remark is made, that "the prophet Ezekiel speaks of water to be *sprinkled*, under the new dispensation."* Was the prophet, I ask, speaking of *any particular outward observance* to be performed, or did he simply convey the idea that God would purify his people from their iniquity? And did he not represent this moral purifying by the emblem of sprinkling, to which their ritual had accustomed them as significant of purification? To me this is so evident from reading the whole connection, that I need no argument to sustain it; and it has always seemed sufficiently strange to me, that any should resort to this prophecy, to ascertain how a *Christian ordinance* should be performed. They surely must be attracted solely by the *word* which occurs in the verse employed, without regarding the idea. Besides, this verse, in like manner as the connected ones, informed the Jews what God would do, not what the ministers of religion would be required to do.

---

* P. 371.

This same passage is referred to, in connection with Isa. 12 : 3. 44 : 3. Zech. 13 : 1, as unfolding the sources whence the Jews might have derived "the opinion, that the Messiah would baptize his disciples."* But how human ingenuity could derive from these passages such an opinion, it is difficult to conceive. If the Jews, at any period of their history, could justly make such a discovery from these passages, they must either have had a very different sort of light from that which is now enjoyed, or else the study of sacred interpretation is a hopeless undertaking, and the opposers of revelation may well call in question the propriety of the apostle Peter's remark, that prophecy is 'a light shining in a dark place.'

I am unable to determine from the language of Prof. Stuart respecting these passages, whether he means to express it as his own belief that the passages, properly interpreted, would lead the Jews to "the opinion that the Messiah would baptize his disciples;" or whether he means only to say, that the Jews of our Saviour's time might, in some way or other, have drawn from them such an opinion. If the latter be his meaning, he does not, of course, make himself responsible for such an interpretation of the passages. This construction of his language is not, however, the obvious one. And yet, though he certainly seems to say so, can it be that Prof. Stuart himself really understands Isa. 12 : 3, *Therefore with joy shall ye draw water out of the wells of salvation*, as adapted to raise an expectation among the Jews "that the Messiah would baptize his disciples?" Or can it be that he considers Isa. 44 : 3, *For I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground: I*

* P. 354.

will pour my Spirit upon thy seed, and my blessing upon thine offspring, as a prophecy of Christian baptism? or that he regards Zech. 13 : 1, *In that day there shall be a fountain opened to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for sin and for uncleanness*, as a prophecy of Christian baptism?

Importance of this Examination.—Infant Baptism.

I may appear to some to have shown a very needless solicitude about modes and forms. In my own judgment, however, it is not a solicitude about a mode or a form, but about an ordinance of the gospel. Now an ordinance of the gospel ought not to be displaced, and an unrequired ceremony substituted in its room; especially when, as in the present circumstances of the religious world, this unrequired ceremony is connected with the additional and the greater error in respect to the recipients of a Christian ordinance. It is not, however, my design to enlarge respecting the proper subjects of baptism; this, I trust, will, in due time, be executed by abler hands. I will just say, that the topics suggested by Prof. Stuart as justifying infant baptism, are far from affording a satisfactory vindication. I here present them. "Commands, or plain and certain examples, in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find. Nor, with my views of it, do I need them. If the subject had respect to what is *fundamental* or *essential* in Christianity, then I must find either the one or the other, in order to justify adopting or practising it. But as the case now is, and the rite itself is but an external rite; the general analogy of the ancient dispensation; the *enlargement* of privilege under the Gospel; the silence of the New Testament on the subject of receiving children

into a special relation to the church by the baptismal rite, which shows, at least, that there was no dispute in early ages relative to this matter; the certainty that in Tertullian's day the practice was general; all these considerations put together—united with the conviction that baptism is *symbol* and *dedication*, and may be so in the case of infants as well as adults; and that it brings parents and children into a peculiar relation to the church, and under peculiarly recognized obligation—serve to satisfy me fully, that the practice may be, and should be, continued."*

Why ought we not to be guided by the New Testament, and to be satisfied with its guidance, on the question, to whom is Christian baptism to be administered? as well as on the question, to whom is the Lord's Supper to be administered? And why might not infant communion, if it had obtained as firm footing and had been continued as generally in the church as infant baptism, be defended by some of these same considerations? In truth, the one practice as a religious ordinance, is quite as improper as the other; the one is quite as incongruous with the nature and design of Christian ordinances as the other. Is there such a peculiarity about baptism, as places it quite out of the range of other scriptural subjects? Is not the question, whether infants are proper subjects of baptism, to be decided by a direct appeal to those parts of the Bible which give information in regard to baptism? While on other questions relating to religious faith and religious duty, plain and clear expressions of the divine will are required, on this, it would seem, they are not needed. On all other subjects, pertaining to religious doctrine and duty, a

* P. 385.

Christian man would ascertain the right path by a simple reference to the word of God; why is not the question of duty in respect to baptism to be decided in the same manner? Why is not the Bible a sufficient, and a sufficiently lucid, directory on this? Ought any man's "*views*" of the ordinance to regulate his conclusion without recurring to "commands, or plain and certain examples;" or ought the word of God to regulate both his views and his conclusion? Is a man who has hitherto been ignorant of Christianity, and who has no views respecting it, but who has now received the whole Bible and is left to its guidance *alone*, is he not in a capacity fully to decide the question of duty as to the scriptural subjects of baptism? Does the great Protestant principle of the sufficiency and the supremacy of the Bible, fail in respect to baptism, and in respect to baptism only? And where, in the whole Bible, is the passage, or the combination of passages, that would suggest to such a man, as I have above supposed, the duty of infant baptism? What one passage in the whole word of God, demands for its fair and full explication, the practice of infant baptism? Let the passage be produced, and the church of Christ will be at rest on this point. Let the passage be produced, and *divine* authority be exhibited; and then the advocates of infant baptism will no longer justly expose themselves to the responsibility of keeping the family of Christ in agitation. But I must not enlarge. Let me state my honest conviction and turn to another matter. On the ground, then, which Prof. Stuart has exhibited, as sustaining infant baptism, and with the scriptural representations of baptism full in my view, I could not, with a good conscience, as a Christian and a minister of the gospel, *adopt* the practice; I see not how I could continue it,

with a good conscience, had I been accustomed to it. I judge not any other man's conscience, on this subject or on any subject. But for myself, I ask a better warrant for doing any thing *in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

Acts 19 : 1—6.

A word or two respecting the fifth verse of this passage may be expected. The following is the whole passage. "And it came to pass, that while Apollos was at Corinth, Paul having passed through the upper coasts, came to Ephesus; and finding certain disciples, he said unto them, Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues and prophesied."

I fully agree with Prof. Stuart in the opinion expressed by him,* that the fifth verse, namely, *when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus*, is the language of Luke, relating what was done to the twelve men after Paul's conversation with them. It never seemed to me right to represent this verse, as the language of Paul, informing these men what was usually

* Pp. 386, 387.

done in the days of John the Baptist. A reader, not thinking of the controversy respecting the verse, could hardly fail to understand it, as the language of Luke the historian, relating that, after Paul had conversed with these men, 'they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus;' and that he then laid his hands on them, with which action was connected the imparting of the Holy Ghost.

Prof. Stuart's reason, however, for the rebaptizing in this case, is not required either by the passage itself, or by the general tenor of the New Testament; namely, because they had been baptized only into an *initiatory* or *preparatory* dispensation.* As to the rebaptizing in this case, I feel no difficulty. It was doubtless a special case. Baptism was required for them by Paul, not because they had been baptized only *unto John's baptism;* but, so far as we can judge from the account, because Paul perceived there had been a radical defect in the instruction they had received previously to being baptized. They had not so much as heard whether there was any Holy Ghost; and from the sketch of Paul's conversation with them respecting John's baptism, it is altogether probable that they had not, in connection with being baptized, been directed to the great object of evangelic faith. It is not said, they had been baptized *by John;* nor is it probable that they did receive baptism from him; for, from the scriptural account of John's proceedings, it is manifest, he was in the habit of communicating instruction respecting the Holy Ghost, and of informing "the people that they should believe on Him which should come after him."† Their baptism, then, was an altogether ignorant and irregular transac-

* P. 388. † Acts 19: 4.

tion; it was, in truth, a nullity. And on this ground, doubtless, the apostle required them, having since become Christians, and having now been properly instructed, to be 'baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.'

A similar view of this passage I find expressed by Knapp, in his lectures on Christian Theology. He says,

"The *practice* of the first Christian Church confirms the point, that the baptism of John was considered essentially the same with Christian Baptism. For those who acknowledged that they had professed, by the baptism of John, to believe in Jesus as the Christ, and who in consequence of this had become in fact his disciples and had believed in him, were not, in a single instance, baptized again into Christ; because this was considered as having been already done. Hence we do not find, that any apostle, or any other disciple of Jesus, was the second time baptized; not even that Apollos mentioned in Acts 18: 25, because he had before believed in Jesus as Christ, although he had received only the baptism of John.

"But all those disciples of John, who had not before acknowledged this truth, and had received the baptism of John or his successors in an entirely different signification, were properly considered at the time of the Apostles as not being baptized, or as wrongly baptized; and all such were therefore required to be baptized expressly into Christ as the Messiah ..... This was the case with those persons whom Paul (Acts 19: 1—5.) permitted to be baptized at Ephesus, although they had already received the baptism of John. There is in this place, nothing that needs to be artificially explained. The meaning is; 'That when they heard from Paul that it was essential to baptism, that one should believe in Jesus as the Lord and Christ (which they hitherto had

not done, since the disciples of John, who baptized them, had said nothing to them about it); they were then willing to suffer themselves to be solemnly obligated by baptism to the acknowledgment of Jesus.' This was the more necessary at that time, as many of the disciples of John had entirely separated themselves from the Christians."*

The Letter from "An Invisible Hand."—Restricted Communion.

To a mere mention of my regret that the missionary brethren in Burmah should have thought it incumbent on them, or even expedient, to inquire of Prof. Stuart, whether they should "*transfer* the Greek word βαπτίζω into the Burman language, when it relates to the ordinance of baptism; or *translate* it by a word significant of immersion, or by a word of some other import,"† (which inquiry, he states, contributed its influence in calling forth his article,) I will add an expression of my regret, that any one should have thought it important or judicious to trouble him with such communications as the one written by "An Invisible Hand," and inserted, in a note, at the commencement of the article. Especially do I regret, that the thought of more distinguished happiness in heaven to be enjoyed by those who are immersed, provided all other things are equal, was permitted to hold so prominent a place in the letter; for this is a subject of somewhat invidious bearing, and one, about which we may very easily incur the charge of attempting to be wise above what is written. This is a motive, too, which in the present world we are poorly able to appreciate. Without attempting to balance be-

* Vol. II. P. 515. † P. 288.

tween higher degrees and lower degrees of glory, larger measures and smaller measures of happiness, it ought to be our simple and undeviating aim to cultivate piety of heart, devotion to our Redeemer, and in true simplicity and godly sincerity to inquire, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' With this habitual cherishing of inward piety, and this unmixed prosecution of external duty as our Lord has enjoined it in his word, we ought to consecrate ourselves, and patiently to commit ourselves, to Him who judgeth righteously, without a question respecting our own reward, or that of our brethren. After all, we shall, every one of us, have too much reason to say, 'We are unprofitable servants.' The best of men, and the best of Christian communities, even in their best estate, fall too far short of their duty, to allow the language of gratulation. The Lord forgive his people for being so unworthy servants. The Lord pour forth his Spirit more abundantly upon the churches, which profess so much regard for his commands and his example.

But while I speak thus, I must also say that Prof. Stuart's reply to his anonymous correspondent, is not adequate and satisfactory. For, even granting that external rites "are valuable only for the instruction which they convey,"* it clearly follows that we ought not to diminish, nor to alter, the significancy of them. And if the particular outward act, which was originally enjoined and practised, be, according to scriptural representation, one of the sources of instruction, then we are not at liberty to depart from that particular outward act; and a solicitude about adhering to that act, does, on this ground, no more involve a belief of mystical

* P. 388.

power in the outward observance, than does a solicitude for maintaining any external appointment which divine authority has established, and which was intended to convey some definite religious instruction, and to make a certain religious impression. A person therefore, while contending for immersion, as baptism, in distinction from all other practices, may be just as free from any Pharisaic notion of merit, or of mystical power in this observance as is any other man who teaches that the ancient rite need not be retained, but who, at the same time, does not feel at liberty to teach that what he calls the rite of baptism may be dispensed with. There is just as much leaven of Pharisaic righteousness in the latter case as in the former.

Nor would consistency require the anonymous writer to go to the Jordan to be baptized;* for the place is a mere uncommanded circumstance. A particular act has been instituted; no particular body of water has been appointed, in which that act is to be performed.

The instance selected from 2 Chron. 30: 18—20 †, to show that we ought not to be strenuous about external rites, is not happily chosen. For the course pursued on the occasion there mentioned, was most remarkably fitted to show the people that the requisitions of the Levitical law were not to be lightly esteemed. It was thought necessary to offer special prayer, that the deviation from the prescribed method of observing the Passover should be *pardoned.* The people "who had not cleansed themselves, yet who did eat the passover otherwise than it was written;" and for whom "Hezekiah prayed, saying, The good Lord pardon every one that prepareth his heart to seek God, the Lord God of his fathers, though he be not cleansed according to the

* P. 389. † P. 389.

purification of the sanctuary," the people, I say, who were personally interested in this affair, and all the Jews, could not, after this transaction, but have a very deep impression concerning the sanctity of the law. And if from this occurrence we are to draw instruction respecting communion in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, I fear the lesson which it would teach would be more unwelcome than is the present practice of Baptist churches. Could it be otherwise than most unpleasant to all concerned, if month after month, and week after week, it should be deemed incumbent, at the close of the communion service, to offer special prayer that the Lord would pardon certain partakers of the ordinance who had sought him in a manner contrary to his arrangements?

I could wish that the essay which I have been examining had contained no reference to communion in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper. But at its close, mention is made of the "brethren who bar up their communion table against all who have not been immersed."* The following sentence deserves notice. "It is indeed a serious responsibility that we take upon ourselves, when we say, in the midst of all the light which the nineteenth century sheds around us, 'I allow you to be a true disciple of Jesus; I hope and believe you have been born of the Spirit; but I cannot sit down with you at the feast of Jesus' dying love, because water has not been applied to you in the same manner as it has to me.'"† This is not a correct, nor a kind, statement of the case. I am constrained to say, (in sorrow that there is *such* an occasion to say it, and with a belief that the error of the representation was not perceived,) I am constrained to

* P. 389. † P. 390.

say that brotherly kindness and justice require a different statement. If immersion be only *one mode of baptism*, and if pouring, and sprinkling, and any application of water, be other *modes of baptism;* if, in short, whatever be the mode in which water is used, still Christian baptism is performed, then the statement would approach to correctness. And if, in addition, it could be shown, that *babes* and *acknowledged unbelievers*, if immersed in water, or if water be poured upon them, or if water be sprinkled upon them, have received Christian baptism, then might the statement be correct. With *Prof. Stuart's* views of baptism, his remark is rightly framed; but he certainly should consider, that *his* views of baptism are totally different from the views of those in reference to whom he framed the remark, and whom he represents as making the remark. Let *his* views of baptism be first clearly proved to be scriptural, as well as the views of those who practise restricted communion, and then if they continue the practice of restricted communion, they will deserve the stigma, to which they have thus far undeservedly, and, I trust, patiently submitted.

Must it be again for the thousandth time repeated, that Baptists believe *only* the immersion of a professed believer in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be Christian baptism; and that they consider Christian baptism as divinely appointed to precede admission into the church and the partaking of the Lord's Supper? And as a consequence, they believe, that if they should encourage the coming to the Lord's Supper, of those whom they cannot but consider as unbaptized, they would be neglecting the authority of the Head of the church, and, so far as principle is concerned, would incur the responsibility of displacing a

Christian ordinance. Much as they value the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, they cannot, with a good conscience, less esteem the ordinance of baptism; but they feel bound by the authority of the King in Zion in respect to baptism, as well as in respect to the Lord's Supper. Let it be clearly proved, that the great body of Christ's followers have hitherto been in a mistake as to the fundamental principle, that baptism (whatever baptism be,) ought to precede admission into the church and to the Lord's Supper, and then there can be no just controversy among real Christians in regard to admission to the Lord's table. But so long as those who regard sprinkling as baptism, yet hold to the fundamental principle, that what is called baptism ought to be received previously to observing the Lord's Supper, they surely ought not to censure Baptists for maintaining the *same* principle, and for being consistent enough to act upon the principle, even in the face of opposition and unkindness from their Christian brethren.*

Even "that distinguished man among" the Baptists, "whose sun has recently gone down, although its beams still illuminate the whole horizon,"† has left upon record the following sentences: "This author," [the person against whom he was writing] "had informed us at the distance of a few lines, that the Pedobaptists in general believe that none ought to come to the Lord's table who are not baptized. If this is correct, we may indeed easily conceive of their being offended with us for deeming

* For a comprehensive discussion of the subject of communion at the Lord's table, I refer the reader to the work entitled "Conversations on Strict and Mixed Communion; in which the principal arguments in favor of the latter practice are stated, as nearly as possible, in the words of its most powerful advocate, the Rev. Robert Hall. By J. G. Fuller."

† P. 390.

them unbaptized; but how our refusal to admit them to communion should become the subject of debate, is utterly mysterious."* Again: "Their practice," [that of the Baptists,] "is the infallible consequence of the opinion generally entertained respecting communion, conjoined with their peculiar views of the baptismal rite. The recollection of this may suffice to rebut the ridicule, and silence the clamor, of those who loudly condemn the Baptists for a proceeding which, were they but to change their opinion on the subject of baptism, their own principles would compel them to adopt. They both concur in a common principle, from which the practice deemed so offensive is the necessary result."†

Let this matter then be placed on its proper ground; namely, Baptists practise restricted communion because (in common with the great body of the Saviour's followers,) they consider the reception of baptism as requisite to admission to the Lord's table; and because, (what is peculiar to them,) they consider those only as baptized who have been immersed on a profession of their faith. Instead of making this matter an occasion of heart-burning and unkind expression, let it be acknowledged, that, painful as the practice may be, (and to whom so painful as to the Baptists themselves?) when *feeling* only, aside from principle, is concerned, it yet has the merit of consistency. It is a regard to consistency and to the Lord's appointment, that makes them willing to separate, in respect to communion in an external ordinance, from those whom they highly respect as partakers of the common salvation, and with whom they rejoice now to participate in true *Christian*

* Works of Robert Hall, Gregory's edition; New York. Vol. I. P. 402.

† Ibid, Vol. II. P. 213.

communion, a communion of spirit, unspeakably more valuable than any external union, and which they hope to enjoy with them perfect, and unalloyed, and immortal in heaven.

The Lord forbid that they should be "ready to break the church in pieces by contending for rites and forms."* The Lord, in the abundance of his compassion, forgive them, if this be their spirit, and bestow upon them a better mind. But if this be not their spirit, if they be actuated by a sincere desire to maintain the authority of the Bible, to know and to obey their Saviour's will in regard to his own institutes, and to induce others to obey the Saviour's will; if it be their sincere wish that all the Lord's people may be united in the bonds of Christian charity and Christian obedience; then, let not their fellow Christians seem to bring an accusation against them, but be gentle towards them, and patient. And let their fellow Christians repair, in singleness of heart, to the Christian statute-book; and, elevated by love to Him who died to redeem them, and who in deeply impressive circumstances said, 'If ye love me, keep my commandments,' let them seriously ponder the question, how they can conscientiously persist in those practices which divide brethren, and respecting which they are not able justly to say, THUS SAITH THE VOLUME OF INSPIRATION.

* P. 390.